The City Council, with certain statutory exceptions, can only take action upon properly posted and listed agenda items.

Unless otherwise noted in the Agenda, the Public can only comment on City-related businesses that are within the jurisdiction of the City Council and/or items listed on the Agenda during the Public Communications portion of this Meeting. The time limit for comments is five (5) minutes per person.

Before speaking to the City Council, please come to the podium and state: Your name, residence, and the organization you represent, if desired. Please respect the time limits.

In compliance with the Americans and Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk, 524-2305. Please notify 48 hours prior to the meeting, which will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2016 – 5:00 PM

5:00 P.M. SESSION

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – (Related to City Business Only) – 5 minute limit per person, 30 minute limit total) Pursuant to Government Code § 54954.3(a), the only public comment that will be permitted during this Special Meeting is that pertaining to the agenda item listed below. Individuals who have received value of $50 or more to communicate to the City Council on behalf of another, and employees speaking on their behalf of their employer, must so identify themselves prior to addressing the City Council. Failure to do so shall be a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of $250. While all comments are welcome, the Brown Act does not allow Council to take action on any item not on the agenda. The Council will respond to comments after Public Communications is closed.

A. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS:
1. Consideration and possible action regarding (1) introduction and first reading of an Ordinance (Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03 and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02) amending the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan; and (2) adoption of a Resolution approving the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154) and authorizing the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney's office. The Project site is located at 540 East Imperial Avenue, in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) Zone (the "Site"). (Applicant: D.R. Horton Homes CA2, Inc.) (Property Owner: El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD))

(Fiscal Impact: None)

Recommendation – 1) Conduct a Public Hearing; Take public testimony and other evidence as presented; 2) Introduce an Ordinance (Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03, and Development Agreement No. DA 16-01 for DA No.10-02) amending the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Development Agreement; 4) Schedule the second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for October 18, 2016; 5) Adopt a Resolution a) adopting the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; b) approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154 for Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02; and c) authorizing the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney's office; 6) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

2. Consideration and possible action regarding the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget (including all City Revenues and Expenditures), and Adoption of Resolution approving the 2016-2017 Final Operating and Capital Improvement Budget and the 2016-2017 Appropriations Limit. Copies of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Preliminary Budget can be found in the Library, City Clerk's Office, and on the City's website. (Fiscal Impact: Total Revenues (including transfers-in) of $112,571,276, Total Expenditures (including transfers-out) of $123,112,234; General Fund Revenues of $67,836,559, Expenditures (including transfers-out) of $69,810,355)

Recommendation – 1) Continue Public Hearing and receive public testimony. Adopt the Resolution approving the 2016-2017 Final Operating and Capital Improvement Budget and the 2016-2017 Appropriations Limit, as presented; 2) Approve the General Fund Reserve Policy (Attachment C); 3) Approve the Economic Uncertainty Reserve Policy (Attachment D); 4) Direct staff to return with an updated employee classification and salary schedule; 5) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

B. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are to be adopted by one motion without discussion and passed unanimously. If a call for discussion of an item is made, the item(s) will be considered individually under the next heading of business.
3. Consideration and possible action regarding approval of an examination plan for Fire Paramedic.
   (Fiscal Impact: None).
   Recommendation – 1) Approve the proposed examination plan; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

4. Consideration and possible action regarding a request for off-site and on-site sale of beer and wine (Type 41 ABC License) for proposed restaurant at 204 Main Street, EA No. 1166, AUP No. 16-11. Applicant: Brewport Group, LLC.
   (Fiscal Impact: N/A).
   Recommendation – 1) Receive and file report for the on-site and off-site sale of beer and wine at a new restaurant at 204 Main Street; 2) Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

CLOSED SESSION:

The City Council may move into a closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Section §54960, et seq.) for the purposes of conferring with the City’s Real Property Negotiator; and/or conferring with the City Attorney on potential and/or existing litigation; and/or discussing matters covered under Government Code Section §54957 (Personnel); and/or conferring with the City’s Labor Negotiators; as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH CITY’S LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov’t Code §54957.6): -6- matters

1. Employee Organizations: Police Management Association; Police Officers Association; Police Support Services Employees Association; Fire Fighters Association; Supervisory and Professional Employees Association; City Employees Association; Executive Management Group (unrepresented group); Management/Confidential (unrepresented employees).

   Agency Designated Representative: Steve Filarsky and City Manager

ADJOURNMENT

POSTED: DATE: 9/22/10
TIME: 5:15 PM
NAME: [Signature]
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Consideration and possible action regarding (1) introduction and first reading of an Ordinance (Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03 and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02) amending the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan; and (2) adoption of a Resolution approving the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154) and authorizing the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office. The Project site is located at 540 East Imperial Avenue, in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) Zone (the “Site”).

(Applicant: D.R. Horton Homes CA2, Inc.)
(Property Owner: El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD))

RECOMMENDED CITY COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Take public testimony and other evidence as presented;
3. Introduce an Ordinance (Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03, and Development Agreement No. DA 16-01 for DA No.10-02) amending the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Development Agreement;
4. Schedule the second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for October 18, 2016;
5. Adopt a Resolution a) adopting the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; b) approving Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154 for Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02; and c) authorizing the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office; and /or
6. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Proposed Ordinance
   A. Proposed Specific Plan
   B. Proposed Development Agreement Amendment
2. Proposed Resolution
   A. Conditions of Approval
   B. Addendum to the EIR for EA 890, 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (August 2016)
   C. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Adopted January 2012)
3. Planning Commission Staff Report Dated, September 8, 2016
4. Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Letters
5. Approved Specific Plan (January 2012)
6. Plans with Amended VTM 71582 (in pocket)

FISCAL IMPACT:
If approved, the proposed project will provide 58 new residential units to the City which would result in an increase in property tax revenue to the City. Additionally, D.R. Horton, through the negotiated Development Agreement Amendment, will provide certain public benefit contributions, as described in more detail in the proposed Amendment.

ORIGINATED BY:  Trayci Nelson, Contract Principal Planner/Project Manager
REVIEWED BY:  Sam Lee, Director Planning and Building Safety
               Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
APPROVED BY:  Greg Carpenter, City Manager

I. INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is a request for:

A. A Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 16-01) to amend the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) Mixed Residential Development Option 2 to allow increased lot coverage for the single-family dwelling units; an increase in the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) for the single family dwelling units; an increase in height for the multi-family stair tower element (only) for the multi-family units; a reduced guest parking standard for the multi-family units; a decrease in the combined front and rear yard setback for the single family homes; a decrease in the street width on the single family residential side; modified modulation requirements; and relief from the LEED Certification requirements.

B. An amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582 to create fewer lots, and to adjust the parcels and street widths to accommodate the D.R. Horton project layout.

C. A Development Agreement Amendment which grants the City public benefits in exchange for development rights detailed herein and requires the developer enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before the first certificate of occupancy is issued for the project.

II. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Background

On January 26, 2012 the El Segundo Planning Commission approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-890, General Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 10-01, Specific Plan 10-03, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06, Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision No. 10-01 for Vesting Tentative Map Nos. 71410 and 71582 to allow for the construction of one of two possible conceptual options on a 5.65-acre surplus school site.

Option 1 consisted of a three-story, 150 unit assisted living complex and a 150-unit senior apartment/condominium complex and four market rate apartments/condominiums. Option
1 allowed for an FAR of 0.75:1 and a height limit of 35 feet for buildings, and 45 feet for parapets.

Option 2 consisted of 34 multi-family dwelling units taking access from Imperial Avenue, and 24 single-family dwelling units taking access from Walnut Avenue, for a total of 58 units. Option 2 allowed for an FAR of 0.53:1, and a height limit of 35 feet for multi-family dwelling units, and 26 feet for single-family units. On March 20, 2012 the City Council approved the project and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The City Council also adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD) has entered into an agreement with D.R. Horton Homes for the latter’s right to purchase and develop the school site property. D.R. Horton Homes seeks to develop the property as expressed in the Option 2 conceptual layout of the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP). Since the approvals under both options of the 540 EIASP were conceptual, in order to design and build the homes to the specific single-family and multi-family product mix unique to the D.R. Horton style, amendments (noted above) to the original approvals are necessary.

On September 8, 2016, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and considered the above-noted entitlement applications. The Planning Commission received public testimony from the applicant and area residents at the hearing. Representatives of D.R. Horton gave an overview of the project. Members of the community spoke mostly in support of the project however, while supportive, many expressed concerns with construction noise and dust, vermin infestation before and during construction, wall heights and view issues during and after construction, lighting, traffic and parking concerns. The Planning Commission discussed the following issues:

- A condition of approval that would require the developer provide notice to the neighborhood before site fumigation and provide perimeter fencing prior to demolition and fumigation;
- The City sump located adjacent to the project site and McCarthy Court;
- Adding language to the Specific Plan to allow a higher, common wall height on the adjoining properties perimeter wall;
- The developer’s request for relief from LEED certification requirements; and
- The amount of the public benefit contribution reflected in the amendment to the Development Agreement.

Pursuant to the Planning Commission’s direction, Condition 59 in the attached Exhibit A to the resolution is modified to add the words “or Demolition”, after “Before any construction”, and Conditions No. 59a and Condition 59b have been added. Consistent with the Planning Commission’s direction, the LEED certification requirement was changed to allow a 15% improvement over 2013 California Energy Code.

The Planning Commission determined that the necessary findings associated with all the applications could be made in a positive manner to warrant approval of the project. Staff and the Applicant addressed the Commission’s issues and questions and after discussing the merits of the project, the Planning Commission on a 5-0 vote adopted Resolution No.
2805 (attached) recommending that the City Council Approve the entitlement applications associated with the development project. Since the project involves a Specific Plan Amendment and a Development Agreement Amendment, the City Council is the decision-making body for the proposed project. As such, it is now before the City Council for consideration.

A public hearing notice for tonight’s meeting was mailed September 15, 2016 to all property owners within a 300-foot radius from the subject property, and published in the El Segundo Herald.

III. ANALYSIS

Project Site and Vicinity

The project site is bordered by East Imperial Avenue to the north, multiple-family residential uses to the east, multiple-family residential uses and East Walnut Avenue to the south, and single-family residential uses and a mortuary to the west. The project site is 0.15 mile south of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The project site is also located approximately 0.8 mile west of Sepulveda Boulevard.

Site topography is varied with an overall slope from northeast to southwest of roughly five percent. The site is currently developed with eight single-story brick structures (totaling 22,488 square-feet) that at one time served as administrative offices and classrooms for the former Imperial Avenue Elementary School that occupied the site. The existing structures on site extend along the eastern property line, from the northern to the southern portion of
the site. A 0.5-acre baseball field, currently utilized for little league baseball on weekends, is also located on the site.

The adjacent area is surrounded primarily with single-family and multi-family residential uses. Additionally, there is a mortuary immediately adjacent to the site at the northeast corner of Sheldon Avenue and East Imperial Avenue. The surrounding uses are as described in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Imperial Highway, community dog park, and LAX (north of the northern City boundary).</td>
<td>Open Space (O-S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-Family and Multi-Family residential uses</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and R-3 (Multi-Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single-Family and Multi-Family residential uses</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and R-3 (Multi-Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-Family residential uses and a Mortuary.</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and C-2 Neighborhood Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to develop the subject property, in accordance with the same general layout for the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, adopted in 2012. The D.R. Horton proposal for Option 2, maintains the same number of single-family and multi-family dwelling units with 24 and 34 units respectively. However, the proposal increases the allowable FAR for the single-family dwelling units, resulting in slightly larger homes. Further, the proposal decreases the building area per dwelling unit for the multi-family units while maintaining the same number of units. There are no proposed changes for Option 1 which will remain part of the amended Specific Plan.

The proposal maintains the same general layout and circulation pattern of the original Option 2 approval. Access to the site will remain unchanged. The multi-family units, located on the northern front portion of the project site, will take access via the same 26-foot-wide two-way driveway along Imperial Avenue. An internal drive aisle would provide
access to guest parking spaces and private parking garages. The 24 single-family units, located on the southern portion of the project site, will also take direct access from the same two-way private loop-street at the southeast corner of the site, connecting to Walnut Avenue. An internal private loop-street would provide vehicular access to the garages of the single-family units. The proposed amendment includes reducing the width of the private loop-street that serves the single-family units from 36-feet wide, down to 26 feet wide at the entrance along Walnut Avenue, then widening to a 32-foot-wide right-of-way as it curves west into the interior of the tract. The El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) has reviewed the map and the proposed plans and are comfortable with the noted reductions. No vehicular access would be provided between the multiple-family residential and the single-family residential uses as approved in the existing Specific Plan.

Parking for the project remains the same for the single-family units (2 car garage per unit), however the total guest parking for the multi-family units is reduced by four spaces. Lot coverage and density remain the same as defined in the 540 East Imperial Specific Plan however, the specific lot coverage calculation for each lot is clarified.

Maximum building height for the single-family units remain unchanged however, the definition of a single-family unit changed slightly, for modulation purposes only. Building heights for the multi-family units increased slightly for the main livable unit, and increased more substantially, to match the heights approved in the assisted living Option 1 component. The increase only applies to a stair tower element on the multi-family units and not for the entire building.

The setback calculation changes slightly for the single-family and multi-family units, but in both instances the changes maintain or increase the setback and provide for a more simplified approach to applying the required setback.

The building modulation requirements have been completely updated and revised to provide greater clarity and ease of application, while providing greater flexibility in design and construction to the homeowner, architect, builder, and staff in the approach and application of the requirement.

The LEED Certification sustainability requirement has been changed to allow for a 15% improvement over the 2013 California Energy Code (Title 24, part 6). Each unit will also be designed to accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and compliance with ESMC 13-1-14 noise insulation standards.

When the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan was approved, it was the property owner’s intent (El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD)) at the time to entitle the property and develop the site at a later time. As such, designs for the product mix were conceptual and provided enough detail that a basic plan could be approved. However, in order to build the homes unique to the D.R. Horton style, amendments to the original Specific Plan approvals are necessary. A comparison of the original Specific Plan standard and the proposed amendment to the standard is provided in Table 2. Where no change to the text of the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan occurs, the standard remains the same and no discussion is provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Plan Item</th>
<th>Approved SP Option 2</th>
<th>Proposed SP Amendment for Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Description        | Construct 34 Multi-family dwelling units and 24 single-family units                   | 34 Multi-family units  
24 Single-family units  
No Change                                                                 |
| Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | (Page 18) 0.53:1 for single-family  
For multi-family lots greater than 15,000 sqft, 1 dwelling unit/2,420 sqft of lot area | (Page 27) 0.58:1 max for single-family  
(Change:+0.05:1)  
1 dwelling unit/2,112 square feet for multi-family with a maximum of 34 units.  
(-308sqft but no increase in units) |
| Lot Coverage/Density       | (Page 17) “The Mixed Unit Development cannot exceed a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family units and thirty-four (34) multi-family units. The exact mix and layout of housing is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with this Specific Plan.” | (Page 21) 24 single family units  
34 multi-family units  
No Change                                                                 |
| Height                     | (Page 17) “Single-family residential dwelling units must comply with ESMC 15-4A” Max height 26 feet.  
“Multi-family dwelling units cannot exceed 35 feet in height” | (Page 21-24) Single-family 26 feet (No Change)  
Change:  
Multi-family: 35 feet 6 inches  
Parapet may extend 42 inches above roof deck  
Roof structures to house stairway access (only) to roof decks...Sloped roof average height of 45 feet/max 47 feet. |
| Access and Parking         | (Page 5- Access) Multi-family from Imperial, Single-family from Walnut               | (Page 10 (Access) Page 27 (Parking))  
Access: Multi-family from Imperial, Single-family from Walnut (No Change)  
Parking: Single-family = 48 (No Change) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Family:</strong> In accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front/Rear:</strong> The combined total of setbacks for the front and rear yards must be at least 30 feet, with no front yard setback less than 22 feet and no rear setback less than 5 feet. Porches and verandas not fully enclosed on 3 sides may encroach into the front setback a maximum of 6 feet. Side: 10% of the width of the lot but not less than 3 feet and need not be more than 6 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Family:</strong> In accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front:</strong> An average of 20 feet but not less than 15 feet. Side: 10% of the width of the lot but never less than 3 feet and need not be more than 5 feet. Rear: 10 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Widths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 foot width/Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modulation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Multi-family = 86 (68 @ 2/unit (enclosed in garages), plus 18 guest spaces @.53/unit (2.53 spaces per unit))** |
| (Change = -.13/unit) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Single-family</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front/Rear:</strong> 20 feet for living areas, 24 feet for garages. Porches and verandas not fully enclosed on 3 sides may encroach 4 feet into the front setback. (Change: -2 feet less in the front. Combined total front and rear setback is 5 feet less however, 5 foot minimum rear setback is still maintained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side: Minimum of 5 feet (Change: straight 5 foot min. No percentage) Side for Lot 1 (only): 5 feet on the west side and 12 feet minimum on the east side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Multi-family:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front:</strong> 20 feet Minimum (Change: No average just 20 feet min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side: 10 feet minimum (Change: Straight 10 foot min. No percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear: 10 feet minimum (No Change)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **32 feet interior to single-family units** (Change: -4 feet width)  |
| 26 feet at Walnut Entrance to single family units (Change -10 foot width) Private streets (No Change)  |

<p>| <strong>(Page 28-30) Single Family: Change: The entire section has been revised to allow</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modulation of the 2nd floor exterior perimeter walls must occur on the second floor of the dwelling that is equal to a minimum of 15% of the building area (including garages and carports) on the ground floor, but not less than 200 sf of area. Modulation must occur on the side of the structure that faces the yards. The total area required to be modulated must be divided equally between both sides of the building facing the side yards. Modulation must be a minimum of 4 feet in depth and must be a maximum of 6 feet in depth. Multi-family: No change</th>
<th>greater flexibility in design and construction:  - On two story homes, the front floor must be setback at least 1 foot from the first floor.  - The 2nd floor shall be no more than 60% of the first floor footprint.  - Modulation of the second floor exterior perimeter walls must occur where the wall is visible from the street.  - Second floor side walls visible from the street must have a varied setback.  - All second story side walls not visible from the street must include 3-dimensional accents.  - Second floor rear walls must have an off-set a minimum of 15 feet. Multi-family: No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Standards</td>
<td>LEED Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesting Tentative Tract Map 71582</td>
<td>31 lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Amended 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan will maintain the affordability requirements set forth in the existing Specific Plan by providing a total of 6 affordable units to qualified households, which represents 10% of the total 58 units. The units will be provided in the multi-family section of the project and will be spread over the entire project by providing one unit in each multi-family building. The units would be similar in exterior appearance, interior appointments, and configuration and basic amenities (such as storage space and outdoor living areas) to the market rate units in the proposed project. Further, covenants and agreements would be recorded against the affordable units, which would be specifically designated as affordable for a term of 20 years, concurrently with the recordation of the final map or the issuance of the certificate of occupancy of the building.

The draft Amendment to the Development Agreement would require the developer to enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before a certificate of occupancy being issued for the project. The Affordable Housing Agreement would outline the developer’s obligations with respect to the affordable units and would be recorded on the property.

Additionally, in an effort to provide a greater opportunity for El Segundo residents to have priority for the affordable units, a condition of approval is proposed that will require the developer to provide a marketing implementation plan that will focus on notification of residents of the availability of the affordable housing and information regarding the requirements and benefits.

**Specific Plan Amendment**

The proposed 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Amendment modifies design guidelines to achieve a more defined project with specific development standards and design guidelines to fit the D.R. Horton product mix. This amendment does not change the underlying zone or general plan land use designation which will remain 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. The Amended Specific Plan will guide the buildout of the project site in a manner that is consistent with City and State policies and standards, and ensures that the project is developed in a coordinated manner. The proposed project, which amends the text of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, would be consistent with the General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives as generally set forth in the draft Resolution.

**General Plan Consistency**

If the Specific Plan Amendment is approved, the land use designation for the project site will remain 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and will remain consistent with the General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives and the Specific Plan as set forth in detail in the draft Resolution.

**Zoning Consistency**

If the Specific Plan Amendment is approved, the zoning designation for the project will remain 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. The Specific Plan would augment the
development standards of El Segundo’s zoning regulations. When an issue, condition or situation occurs which is not covered or provided for in the Specific Plan, the zoning regulations that are most applicable to the issue, condition or situation will apply. The proposed conceptual project (Option 1 or Option 2) meets the development standards set forth in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan § 4.2 Development Standards.

**Amendment to Development Agreement**

As noted above, the Planning Commission approved the underlying Development Agreement No. 10-02 in 2012. The applicant proposes, through the amendment to the Development Agreement, to provide certain public benefit contributions in the form of monetary compensation in exchange for the vested rights associated with a Development Agreement. Specific details are enumerated in the proposed Development Agreement Amendment (attached).

The developer proposes an Amendment to the Development Agreement that references the amendment to the Specific Plan. The draft Amendment would also require the developer to enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before the certificate of occupancy is issued for the project.

The Development Agreement, as amended, would provide the following public benefits in exchange for valuable development rights (10-year entitlement with an option for a 5-year extension):

1. Development of a property that is currently vacant and underutilized.
2. Increase housing, in particular much needed affordable for area residents.
3. Development of a project that is consistent with the General Plan.
4. Development of a property that includes affordable housing for the community with a ten percent set aside required for Option 2.

**Vesting Tentative Map**

If this project is approved allowing the Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map (No. 71582), the amended map would subdivide the property into 25 lots, plus one lettered lot that contains the interior loop-street, resulting in a reduction of 6 lots compared to the original 2012 approval. Lot No. 25, which is the multi-family portion of the property, will be subdivided for condominium purposes. ESMC § 14-1-6 requires the Planning Commission to deny a request for a subdivision map if it makes any of the findings consistent with Government Code § 66474: Based upon the administrative record, it does not appear that any facts would support findings for denial for the proposed project (see findings in attached draft Resolution No. ___- attached). The vesting tentative map would expire twenty-four months after approval or conditional approval but may be extended for a period not to exceed five years, pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and ESMC § 14-1-12. The development rights expire when the vesting tentative map expires unless a final map is approved before the expiration date.
Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Review

In accordance with the Public Utilities Code (PUC) §21676, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) (the LA County Planning Commission) is responsible for reviewing local jurisdiction’s actions to determine compatibility with the adopted Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The type of project requiring ALUC review includes adoption and amendment of specific plans affecting property within an established ALUP planning boundary. Since the proposed project is a specific plan on property located within the airport influence area established for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), the project must be reviewed by the ALUC for consistency with the ALUP. Recommendations made by the ALUC are advisory only to local jurisdictions. The final decision to agree or disagree with an ALUC consistency determination is at the discretion of the local jurisdiction’s final decision making body, which is the El Segundo City Council. On February 22, 2012, the ALUC reviewed the 540 East Specific Plan Project and found it to be consistent with the ALUP subject to the following conditions:

- Avigation easements must be established for each new parcel created by the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and no vesting tract map of building permit will be issued until the avigation easements are in place. The avigation easements must run with the deed and title of the land and be transferred to every successive property owner.

- The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, must be informed of and have approval over the nature and scope of the avigation easements for the new parcels created by the Specific Plan.

- The notice of airport in the vicinity that is referenced in EIR mitigation Measure 4.3-7 shall also specify in plain and explicit language the property is located in the airport influence area of Los Angeles International Airport and by residing in this location, residents will be subject to exterior noise levels of 65dB and above as well as vibrations and fumes due to the sites proximity of the airport.

The proposed amendments to the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan were forwarded to ALUC for its review. The ALUC found the modifications to be consistent with the ALUP and did not require further ALUC review (see ALUC Determination letter Exhibit C). The conditions noted above will remain in effect.

IV. INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

The project application and plans were circulated for comment. Staff has incorporated those comments as conditions of approval in the Resolution.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and an Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Environmental Assessment No. 890 (540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan) was prepared pursuant to CEQA
Guidelines Section 15164. Under CEQA, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR is appropriate if minor changes or additions to the EIR are necessary to reflect the proposed modifications to the project in the environmental analysis and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred (CEQA Guidelines §15164). Generally, the conditions described in Section 15162 have not occurred if the proposed modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines §15164[c]); however, an addendum must be considered by the decision-making body before making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines §15164[d]).

This Addendum to the previously-certified EIR demonstrates that the environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation measures identified in the 2012 EIR for Environmental Assessment No. EA-890 remain substantively unchanged despite the proposed project revisions. It supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the significance level of impacts identified in the previous Environmental Impact Report. The mitigation measures listed in the certified EIR for EA 890, are sufficient to reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

It is important to note that in 2012, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC) for the following EA 890 impact areas:

**Air Quality - Construction.** Temporary construction activities for either Option 1 or Option 2 would violate air quality standards for VOC’s even with full implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM4.1-1 through MM4.1-16).

**Noise - Operation.** While neither project (Option 1 or Option 2) would result in a substantial ongoing increase in exterior noise levels during operation, both project Options would increase the permanent, noise sensitive residential population on the project site even with full implementation of MM4.3-6 and MM4.3-7 because of the site’s proximity to LAX.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations is required when a project will cause an unavoidable significant impact that cannot be mitigated. To the extent the impacts would remain significant after mitigation, the impacts were acceptable and outweighed by social, economic and other benefits of the projects. The Addendum found these impacts would not be made worse by the project modifications. Therefore, the Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC), as adopted by the City Council in 2012 (Resolution 4772 and Ordinance 1469), will remain.

**VI. PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMENTS**

D.R. Horton conducted two, two-hour community outreach meetings; one on July 27, 2016 and one on August 17, 2016. The meetings were held at the El Segundo Unified School
District Office Board Room located at 641 Sheldon Street. Both workshops were well attended with more than 30 people in attendance, including local residents, members of the EUSD School Board, City staff, and other government officials. Visitors were able to see the project plans, watch a 3D video of the project, and ask questions of the D.R. Horton team. Overall comments were positive.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Planning Staff recommend that the Council introduce Ordinance (Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03, and Development Agreement No. DA 16-01 for DA No.10-02) amending the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Development Agreement; schedule second reading and adoption of the Ordinance for October 18, 2016; and adopt Resolution No. ___ approving the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154 for Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02; and authorize the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office.
Attachment #1

ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE
SPECIFIC PLAN (540EIASP) AND AMENDING THE DEVELOPMENT
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO AND THE EL
SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT RELATING TO THE SAME

(SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16-01;
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT NO. 16-01)

The City Council of the city of El Segundo does ordain as follows;

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. On January 26, 2012, the El Segundo Planning Commission
approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-890, General
Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 10-01,
Specific Plan 10-03, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06,
Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision No. 10-
01 for Vesting Tentative Map Nos. 71410 and 71582 to allow
for the construction of one of two possible conceptual options
on a 5.65-acre surplus school site. Option 1 consisted of a
three-story, 150 unit assisted living complex and a 154-unit
senior apartment/condominium complex. Option 2 consisted
of 34 multi-family dwelling units taking access from Imperial
Avenue, and 24 single-family dwelling units taking access
from Walnut Avenue, for a total of 58 units;

B. On March 20, 2012, the City Council approved the project
and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

C. On May 1, 2016, D.R. Horton Homes CA2 Inc. (the
applicant), filed an application with approval from the El
Segundo Unified School District (the property owner) for
Environmental Assessment (EA No. 1154), Specific Plan
Amendment No. 16-01 for Specific Plan No. 10-03,
Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for
Development Agreement No 10-03, and Amended
Subdivision No. 16-01 for Vesting Tentative Map No. 71582
for 25 lots, to modify the Option 2 portion of the 540 East
Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, to allow construction of a 58-
unit mixed residential development ("proposed project");

D. The applications were reviewed by the City of El Segundo
Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part,
consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

E. In addition, the City reviewed the project's environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, et seq., "CEQA"), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the "CEQA Guidelines"), and the City's Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);

F. An Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines § 15164;

G. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before the Planning Commission for September 8, 2016;

H. On September 8, 2016, the Commission held a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City staff and public testimony, and representatives of D.R. Horton Homes CR2 Inc., and adopted Resolution No.2805 recommending that the City Council approve the project;

I. On September 28, 2016, the City Council held a public hearing and considered the information provided by City staff and public testimony regarding this Ordinance; and

J. This Ordinance and its findings are made based upon the entire administrative record including, without limitation, testimony and evidence presented to the City Council at its September 28, 2016 hearing and the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department.

SECTION 2: Environmental Assessment. The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. The City completed an Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project. Under CEQA, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR is appropriate if minor changes or additions to the EIR are necessary to reflect the proposed modifications to the project in the environmental analysis and none of the conditions
described in section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred (CEQA Guidelines §15164). Generally, the conditions described in Section 15162 have not occurred if the proposed modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines §15164[c]); however, an addendum must be considered by the decision-making body before making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines §15164[d]).

B. This Addendum to the previously-certified EIR demonstrates that the environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation measures identified in the 2012 EIR for Environmental Assessment No. EA-890 remain substantively unchanged despite the proposed project revisions. It supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the previous Environmental Impact Report. The mitigation measures listed in the certified EIR for EA 890, are still sufficient to reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

C. The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC) for the following EA 890 impact areas:

A. Air Quality - Construction. Temporary construction activities for either Option 1 or Option 2 would violate air quality standards for VOC's even with full implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM4.1-1 through MM4.1-16).

B. Noise - Operation. While neither project (Option 1 or Option 2) would result in a substantial ongoing increase in exterior noise levels during operation, both project Options would increase the permanent, noise sensitive residential population on the project site even with full implementation of MM4.3-6 and MM4.3-7 because of the site's proximity to LAX. This Addendum found these impacts were not made worse by the project modifications. Therefore, the Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC), adopted by Council Resolution 4772 and Ordinance 1469, will remain.

SECTION 3: General Plan and Specific Plan Findings. After considering the above facts, the City Council finds as follows:

A. Following a Specific Plan Amendment, the General Plan Land Use Designation of the project site will remain unchanged; 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (EIASP). This designation is intended for senior housing consisting of apartments or
condominiums, senior housing consisting of assisted and/or independent living units, single-family and/or multi-family housing units consisting of market rate and affordable apartments or condominiums. As conditioned, the proposed project Option 1 or Option 2 would be compatible with the General Plan.

B. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies in the Land Use Element. Implementation of the proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU3-2.1 to "promote high quality Multi-Family Residential developments with ample open space, leisure and recreational facilities." If approved, the development will be built and maintained in accordance with these requirements and regulations and the requirements and regulations of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.

C. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU3-3 to "encourage the development of viable attractive neighborhoods, free from blight and deterioration" in that the project will provide a new housing development on a site that is currently developed with eight vacant and deteriorating single-story brick structures formerly used as classrooms and offices for the Imperial Avenue Elementary School.

D. The proposed project is consistent with Housing Element Goal 2 to "Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate income households," Housing Element Policy 2.1 to "establish and maintain land use controls to accommodate the housing needs of the elderly, disabled, and other special needs households; and Housing Element Policy 2.2 to "facilitate the creation of affordable home ownership opportunities for extremely low, very low, and low income households; in that the project will provide much need housing for all income levels with a 15 percent set aside for extremely low, very low and low income households in Option 1, and a 10% set aside for Option 2.

E. The proposed project is consistent with certain Circulation Element Objectives and Policies based upon a Traffic Study performed for the project. The Traffic Study determined that the proposed project Option 1 would generate 956 daily trips with 46 morning peak hour, and 83 evening peak hour trips. Option 2 would generate 428 daily trips, 34 in the morning peak hour and 42 in the evening peak hour. Additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by a traffic mitigation fee. The Traffic Study found that neither Option 1 nor Option 2 of the proposed project would significantly impact any
study intersections therefore, no mitigation measures are required or proposed for the project. Consequently, the project is consistent with the following Circulation Element Objectives and Policies:

1. C1-1 to "provide a roadway system that accommodates the City's existing and projected land use and circulation needs."

2. C1-1.2 to "pursue implementation of all Circulation Element policies such that all Master Plan roadways are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service."

3. C1-1.14 to "require a full evaluation of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed new development prior to project approval. Further, require the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures prior to, or in conjunction with, project development. Mitigation measures may include new roadway links on segments that would connect the new development to the existing roadway system, intersection improvements, and other measures. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer."

4. C2-1.3 to "encourage new developments in the City to participate in the development of the citywide system of pedestrian walkways and require participation funded by the project developer where appropriate." Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City Standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

5. C2-1.4 to "ensure the installation of sidewalks on all future arterial widening or new construction projects, to establish a continuous and convenient link for pedestrians. Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project as required by the Department of Public Works.

6. 3-1.1 to "require all new development to mitigate project-related impacts on the existing and future circulation system such that all Master Plan roadways and intersections are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service through implementation of all applicable Circulation Element policies. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the
project developer."

7. C3-1.8 to “require the provision of adequate pedestrian and bicycle access for new development projects through the development review process.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project that will provide adequate pedestrian access. Adequate bicycle access will be available to the site.

8. C3-2.1 to “ensure the provision of sufficient on-site parking in all new development.” The proposed project is required to provide on-site parking at the following ratios: 1) 2 garage spaces for each unit and 1 additional space for dwelling units exceeding 3,000 square feet of gross floor area, 2) 2.53 per multi-family unit.

F. The proposed project is consistent with Noise Element Policy N1-1.9 that requires “review of all new development projects in the City for conformance with California Airport Noise Regulations and California Noise Insulation Standards (Code of California Regulations, Title 24) to ensure interior noise will not exceed acceptable levels” and Program N1-1.9A that requires “all new habitable residential construction in areas of the City with an annual CNEL of 60 dBA or higher shall include all mitigation measures necessary to reduce interior noise levels to minimum state standards. Post construction acoustical analysis shall be performed to demonstrate compliance.”

G. The proposed project is consistent with Noise Element Policy N1-2.1 that requires “all new projects to meet the City’s Noise Ordinance Standards as a condition of building permit approval” and Program N1-2.1A that “addresses noise impacts in all environmental documents for discretionary approval projects, to ensure that noise sources meet City Noise Ordinance standards” in that the DEIR addressed noise sources that include: mechanical and electrical equipment and truck loading areas as specified in Program N1-2.1A.

H. The proposed project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy CN5-1 in that the project will preserve the character and quality of existing neighborhood; Conservation Element Policy CN5-6 to encourage that any new landscaped areas respect and incorporate distinctive elements of the community landscape; Conservation Element Policy CN5-8 to increase the quantity of
plant material; and Conservation Element Policy CN5-9 to increase the diversity of plant species.

SECTION 4: Amendment to Development Agreement Findings. Pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 3268 and Government Code §§ 65857.5 and 65858, the City Council finds that:

A. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the General Plan as described above and the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540EIASP), as amended by this ordinance.

B. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement is compatible with the uses authorized in, and the regulations prescribed for, the land use district in which the real property is located. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement provides public benefits to the City in the form of monetary compensation in exchange for the vested rights associated with Development Agreements. The Development Agreement also includes reimbursement to the City for its set up and oversight of the affordable housing component. The Agreement does not change the underlying General Plan Land Use or Zoning designation.

C. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement conforms with public convenience, general welfare and good land use practice. The Development Agreement, as amended, provides the following public benefits in exchange for valuable development rights (ten-year entitlement with a five-year option):

1. Development of real property with vacant improvements and underutilized land uses.

2. Increasing housing, in particular much-needed market rate and affordable housing for area residents.

3. Developing a project that is consistent with the General Plan.

4. Developing a property that includes affordable housing for the community with a 10% set aside for low, very low, and extremely low income qualified households.

D. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement provides public benefits to the City in the form of monetary compensation in exchange for the vested rights associated with Development Agreements. The Development Agreement also includes reimbursement to the City for its set up and
oversight of the affordable housing component.

E. The proposed amendment to the Development Agreement will not adversely affect the orderly development of property or the preservation of property values. This project is surrounded by previously-developed neighborhoods and will help improve the value of neighboring properties. The proposed Development Agreement, as amended, will ensure that the project will be developed in an orderly fashion.

SECTION 5: Approval of Amendments. The City Council hereby amends the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, as reflected in the attached Exhibit A, and amends Development Agreement No. 10-02 between the City and El Segundo Unified School District, as reflected in the First Amendment No. 16-01, attached as Exhibit B. Both Exhibits A and B are incorporated herein by this reference. Except as expressly amended in the attached exhibits, the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Development Agreement remain the same and in effect, and nothing in this Ordinance should be construed as affecting or otherwise disturbing the underlying approval of such documents.

SECTION 6: Severability. If any part of this Ordinance or its application is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the City Council intends that such invalidity will not affect the effectiveness of the remaining provisions or applications and, to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 7: Reliance On Record. Each and every one of the findings and determination in this Ordinance are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the City Council in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 8: Limitations. The City Council’s analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the City Council’s lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the city’s ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 9: The City Clerk is directed to certify the passage and adoption of this Ordinance; cause it to be entered into the City of El Segundo’s book of original ordinances; make a note of the passage and adoption in the records of this meeting; and, within fifteen (15) days after the passage and adoption of this Ordinance, cause it to be published or posted in accordance with California law.
SECTION 10: This Ordinance will become effective on the thirty-first (31st) day following its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of ____________, 2016.

Suzanne Fuentes, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA     )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES   )      SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO      )

I, Tracy Weaver, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Ordinance No. ________ was duly introduced by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ___ day of __________, 2016, and was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the ___ day of __________, 2016, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
1.0 SUMMARY

This Specific Plan was prepared to provide guidance and to allow flexibility when developing a 5.68-acre parcel located on a former El Segundo School District Site at 540 East Imperial Avenue (the "Project Site") consistent with the adjoining uses.

Under this Specific Plan, there are two options for development a Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential Option (Option 1 and described on page 6) and a Mixed Residential Development Option (Option 2) described here. Option 2 includes a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family and thirty-four (34) multi-family units accessed by private streets. The multiple-family units will front East Imperial Avenue on the northern portion of the Project Site. The single-family residences will be located to the south of the multiple-family units and will take access from East Walnut Avenue. The Mixed Residential development will be of similar scale to the existing development in the area. The architectural styles will be Contemporary for the multi-family townhomes adjacent to Imperial Avenue and a mixture of Contemporary and Arts and Crafts for the single family homes. Refer to Exhibits 1 and 2.

Exhibit 1 - Front Elevation of Multifamily Building
Exhibit 2 - Single-Family Streetscene

Detailed text and exhibits which more fully describe the conceptual options and improvements envisioned for construction are included in this Specific Plan. The Specific Plan will guide the build-out of the Project Site in a manner that is consistent with City and State policies and standards and ensures that the Project is developed in a coordinated manner.

1.1 Purpose and Authority of Specific Plan

The purpose of this Specific Plan is to provide a foundation for the proposed land uses on the subject property through the application of regulations, standards and design guidelines. The 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan provides text and exhibits which describe the proposed land uses and associated guidelines.

This Specific Plan has been adopted in accordance with the provisions of Government Code §§ 65450 through 65457 which grant local governments authority to prepare Specific Plans of development for any area regulated by a General Plan. These sections also identify the required contents of a Specific Plan and mandate consistency with the General Plan.

According to Government Code § 65450, a Specific Plan must include text and a diagram or diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:

- The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space within the area covered by the plan.
The proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the land area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan.

Standards and criteria by which development will proceed, and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.

A program of implementation measures including regulations, programs, public works projects and financing measures necessary to carry out the above items.

A discussion of the relationship of the Specific Plan to the General Plan.

A thorough review of the El Segundo General Plan shows that this Specific Plan is compatible and consistent with the goals and policies outlined in the General Plan. This Specific Plan will further the goals and policies of the General Plan as more fully described below.

This Specific Plan was prepared to provide the essential relationship between the policies of the El Segundo General Plan and actual development in the project area. By functioning as a regulatory document, the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan provides a means of implementing and detailing the City of El Segundo’s General Plan. All future development plans and entitlements within the Specific Plan boundaries must be consistent with the standards set forth in this document.

1.2 Project Goals

The goal of this Specific Plan is to develop housing within the City of El Segundo which will help the City achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation, including the opportunity to develop affordable housing.

1.3 Project Location And Adjacent Land Uses

Regionally, the Project Site is located in the northwest quadrant of the City of El Segundo, adjacent to the City’s northern border along Imperial Avenue. The Project Site is almost one mile east of Sepulveda Boulevard (Highway 1) and the entrance to the Century Freeway (Interstate 105), approximately 2.4 miles east of the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405), and immediately south of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

Locally, the Project Site is located on the south side of East Imperial Avenue between Sheldon Avenue and McCarthy Court. Immediately to the west of the Project Site on Imperial Avenue is a mortuary in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) Zone; single-family residences abut the remainder of the western boundary of the Project Site. Immediately to the east of the Project Site are R3 lots with multi-family residences; and single-family residences lie at the southeastern property line. The Project Site borders R-3 with multi-family residences on the southern property line refer to Exhibit 3.
1.4 PROJECT SITE HISTORY

The 5.68-acre Project Site comprises six (6) lots and is currently developed with the Imperial Avenue Elementary School. The elementary school was built in 1956. Because of declining enrollment in the El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD), the school campus was closed in 1975 and in 1979 was declared Surplus Property by ESUSD. In 1984, it was used as an employee training facility for the Hughes Aircraft Company. In 1997, the school campus was re-opened under a lease to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) as a special needs school, but was closed again a few years later. In 2007, the ESUSD Board of Education established a 7-11 Surplus Property Committee to determine what should be done with the site. The Committee work developed in three phases: information gathering; public input; and discussion. Based on the Committee’s work in 2009, the District began the process to entitle the site for development.

In September 2010, the District applied for various land use entitlements that would allow the site to be developed with a Senior Housing Community. In November 2010, the District revised its applications to provide for the option of building either a Senior Housing Community or a Mixed Residential development.

Before approving this Specific Plan and other related applications, the General Plan designation and the zoning of the site was Planned Residential Development (PRD) which allowed a maximum of 29 single-family units and 36 multi-family units to be built on the entire 5.68 acre site. The change of both the General Plan and zoning to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan allows for either option (discussed above) to be developed.
1.5 EXISTING SITE

The proposed Project Site is currently developed with eight (8) single-story structures (totaling 22,488 square feet) that served as administrative offices and classrooms. Existing structures at the Project Site extend from the northern to the southern portion of the site, along the eastern property line. Development on the Project Site also includes open space and recreational facilities in the form of playground equipment and an approximately 0.50-acre baseball field on the west-northwest portion of the property. Several scattered trees line the western portion of the project site with ground cover near the baseball field. Generally, the project site slopes from a high point at the northwest corner of the site, along East Imperial Avenue, to a low point at the southeast corner of the site along Walnut Avenue. The site is graded into two pads with a 2:1 slope separating them. The overall slope of the site from northwest to southeast is roughly 5 percent. Impervious surfaces on the site consist of asphalt parking areas and building roofs. Pervious surfaces on the proposed Project Site consist of open space and a ball field.

The Specific Plan area will encompass the entire 5.68-acre site.

1.6 CEQA COMPLIANCE

In compliance with CEQA, an EIR was prepared for this Project. The EIR analyzed two separate Options: a Senior Housing Community consisting of 150 assisted living units and 150 senior apartments/townhomes with four townhomes built on the southern portion of the property; and a mixed residential development consisting of 24 single-family homes and 34 multi-family homes.

In accordance with Government Code § 65457, any residential development that is developed consistent with this Specific Plan is exempt from further CEQA analysis unless an event specified in Public Resources Code § 21166 occurs as to the Specific Plan.

1.7 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 540 East Imperial Avenue site will be developed in substantial conformance with one of the Options described below.

Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Specific Plan Option 1)

The Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Specific Plan Option 1) would consist of the following types of development, with the assisted living and senior residential both restricted to individuals fifty-five (55) years or older:

- On 5.35 acres: an assisted living development consisting of dwelling units made up of: assisted and/or independent living units which will provide common facilities such as a common kitchen and dining room, game playing area, library, exercise room, pool and restrooms, as well as individual kitchenettes which at a minimum will include a refrigerator, sink and microwave; and a senior residential development consisting of apartments and/or condominiums. The development would include a maximum of 150 assisted/independent living units and 150 senior apartments/townhomes.

- The southern 0.33 acres of the Project Site which fronts on Walnut Avenue would be developed under Multi-Family Residential (R-3) standards. Four (4) townhomes would be built on the remaining 0.33-acre parcel, located at the southern end of the Project Site.

AUGUST 29, 2016
While the four townhomes are part of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan development, they would be re-zoned and developed separately from the larger assisted/independent living complex and senior apartments/townhomes, pursuant to the Multi-Family Residential (R-3) development standards.

Mixed Residential Development Option (Specific Plan Option 2)
Under the Mixed Residential Development Option (Specific Plan Option 2) the property would be developed with a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family and thirty-four (34) multi-family units on private streets. The multiple-family units would front East Imperial Avenue on the northern portion of the Project Site. The single-family residences would be located on the southern portion of the Project Site.

1.8 ENTITLEMENTS

The following entitlements were granted in January 2012 in conjunction with this Specific Plan.

- A General Plan Amendment changed the land use designation from Planned Residential Development (PRD) to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.

- Zone Text Amendment: 1) deleted the Planned Residential (PRD) Zone from El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") § 15-3-1; 2) added 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to ESMC § 15-3-1; 3) added a new ESMC § 15-3-2(A)(7) "540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan"; and 4) deleted ESMC Chapter 15-4D (Planned Residential Development (PRD) in its entirety.

- Map Zone Change from Planned Residential Development (PRD) to 540 East Avenue Imperial Specific Plan.

- Development Agreement between the City of El Segundo and the El Segundo Unified School District.

- Vesting Tentative Map No. 71410 - dividing the Specific Plan Area into seven (7) new parcels or Vesting Tentative Map No. 71582 dividing the Specific Plan Area into thirty one (31) new parcels.

- As part of the Amendment (September 2016), the Specific Plan Area will be divided into twenty five (25) parcels as shown on Amended Vesting Tentative Map No. 71410.
2.0 CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN

Government Code § 65454 requires that the Specific Plan be consistent with the General Plan. Government Code § 65451 requires a statement of relationship between the Specific Plan and the General Plan. As documented by the EIR certified on March 20, 2012, and the subsequent addendum (September 2016), the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan. The two elements that are most related to the Project are the Land Use Element and the Housing Element; the consistency with these two elements is discussed below.

2.1 LAND USE ELEMENT

The City amended the General Plan designation and zoning of the Project Site to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to allow the development options set forth in this Specific Plan of either a Senior Housing Community with a multi-family component or a Mixed Residential development. The Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Option 1) may consist of an Assisted Living development and/or a Senior Residential development. Although the Senior Housing Community would allow the opportunity for more development than the previous zoning, senior housing does not generate significant noise, traffic or other impacts that would be detrimental to neighboring residential uses. Due to the size and slope of the property, the Senior Housing Community would be designed in such a way so as to minimize the visual impacts on the surrounding residential uses.

The Specific Plan also provides that the Mixed Development Option (Option 2) will be limited to not more than twenty-four (24) single-family units and not more than thirty-four (34) multi-family units. This is very similar to what was previously allowed and therefore this use remains consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element. The Specific Plan allows design flexibility that considers the surrounding residential uses and continues to protect one of the City’s greatest attributes, its residential area.

More specifically, the Specific Plan promotes the following from the Land Use Element of the City’s General Plan:

- **Goal LU3: Proper Distribution of Residential Land Uses** – Promote the health, safety and well being of the people of El Segundo by adopting standards for the proper balance, relationship, and distribution of the residential land uses.

- **Objective LU3-2** – Preserve and maintain the City’s low-medium density residential nature, with low building height profile and character, and minimum development standards.
  - **Policy LU3-2.1** - Promote construction of high quality Multi-Family Residential developments with ample open space, leisure and recreational facilities.
  - **Policy LU3-2.2** - Multi-family developments will be located only in appropriate places and evaluated carefully to insure that these developments are not detrimental to the existing single-family character.
• Policy LU3-2.3 - Appropriate buffers such as walls, landscaping, or open space, shall be provided between residential and non-residential uses.

• Policy LU3-2.4 - Low density areas shall be preserved and zone changes to higher density shall be carefully investigated for compatibility to existing uses.

2.2 HOUSING ELEMENT

In November 2013, the City adopted the most current version of its Housing Element which recognizes the Project Site as an underutilized site, development of which will help satisfy the City's housing needs. More specifically the Specific Plan implements the following goals of the Housing Element (as adopted in 2013):

• **Goal 2:** Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate-income households.

  • Policy 2.1 - Establish and maintain land use controls to accommodate the housing needs of elderly, disabled and other special needs households.

  • Policy 2.2 - Facilitate the creation of affordable home ownership opportunities for extremely low, very low and low income households.

• **Goal 3:** Provide opportunities for new housing construction in a variety of locations and a variety of densities in accordance with the land use designations and policies in the Land Use Element.

  • Policy 3.1 - Provide for the construction of 69 new housing units during the 2014-2021 planning period in order to meet the goals of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) per the 2013 Housing Element.

  • Policy 3.3 - Permit vacant and underdeveloped property designated as residential to develop with a diversity of types, prices and tenure.

  • Policy 3.4 - Encourage new housing to be developed within the Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use district, and on the Imperial School site.
3.0 PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

3.1 CIRCULATION

Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Option 1)

In order to reduce traffic impacts along Walnut Avenue, a 0.33 acre lot on the southerly side of the Project Site will be created for multi-family housing which will be physically separated from the rest of the Project Site. Access to the remaining 5.35 acres, which will house the Senior Housing Community, will be via two driveways on East Imperial Avenue which will provide circulation and emergency access throughout that portion of the Project Site.

Mixed Residential Development Option (Option 2)

The Mixed Residential Development includes one 24-foot-wide two-way driveway along Imperial Avenue to serve the 34 multi-family units. An internal drive aisle would provide access to public parking areas or multi-family garages. A two-way private street would be provided at the southeast corner of the site, connecting to Walnut Avenue, to provide direct access for the 24 single-family residential units. An internal 32-foot-wide private loop-street would provide access to the private single-family garages. No vehicular access would be provided between the multiple-family residential and the single-family residential uses located on the northern and southern portions of the Project Site, respectively which will minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding streets. The circulation system will be developed so as to be adequate for emergency vehicles.

Bus stops are located on Imperial Highway directly north of the proposed Project Site, on Sepulveda Boulevard located approximately 0.82 mile east of the proposed Project Site, on Grand Avenue located approximately 0.80 mile south of the proposed Project Site, and on Main Street located approximately 0.32 mile west of the proposed Project Site. The City of Redondo Beach; Beach Cities Transit Line 109; the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Lines 125, 232, and 625; the Municipal Area Express (MAX) Lines 2, 3, and 3X; the Los Angeles Department of Transportation Commuter Express (CE) Lines 574 and 438; and the Gardena Municipal Bus Line currently serve the proposed Project Site.

3.2 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

A. Water Service

Water service is provided by the City of El Segundo and is currently available within the Specific Plan area. The site is currently served by connections to an existing 6-inch diameter main in Walnut Avenue and 10-inch main in Imperial Avenue. The Project would maintain these connections to provide a loop system between Imperial and Walnut Avenues to provide for on-site domestic and fire water services.

B. Sewer Service

Sewer service within the Project Site, which is west of Sepulveda Boulevard, is provided by underground sewers maintained by the City of El Segundo. The site is currently served by an 8-inch sewer running along the easterly property line, which drains to an...
existing 8-inch main in Walnut Avenue. The Project would continue to drain to Walnut Avenue. Wastewater would be treated at the Hyperion Sewage Treatment Plant (HTP) which has capacity to treat the wastewater generated at the Project Site.

C. Solid Waste Disposal

Solid waste disposal is provided to commercial users by a variety of private haulers and to residential users by Consolidated Waste Disposal. Landfill capacity is adequate for the assumed population and commercial growth within Los Angeles County. The 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan would not exceed any assumptions for either population or commercial growth in the region.

D. Gas Service

Gas service is provided by Southern California Gas Company. A 2-inch service line is available in Walnut Avenue.

E. Electric/Telephone and Cable Service

Electric service is provided by Southern California Edison. Telephone service is provided by AT&T, Verizon and Sprint via existing lines in adjacent streets and cable service is provided by Time Warner Cable, Direct TV and Dish Network.

F. Fire Suppression

The El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) provides fire protection services and emergency medical service to the City. The Specific Plan area is approximately 1 mile from Station 1 located at 314 Main Street in Downtown El Segundo and approximately 1.8 miles from Fire Station 2 located at 2261 Mariposa Avenue. Water for fire suppression is available from existing water lines via hydrants adjacent to the Project Site. Private hydrants will be installed if required to provide coverage for approved structures. Applicable fire services development impact fees will be paid at the time of building permit issuance.

G. Police Services

The El Segundo Police Department provides police protection services to the City. The Specific Plan area is approximately 1 mile from the police station located at 348 Main Street. Applicable police services development impact fees will be paid at the time of building permit issuance.

H. Drainage

Stormwater runoff would be conveyed via storm drains to a underground retention facility within the right-of-way (access easement near Walnut. A sump exists between the eastern border of the proposed project and McCarthy Court. Existing 27-inch and 24-inch storm drains connect from the sump to the 18-inch storm drain along McCarthy Court. In addition, the proposed project site would be served by existing 18-inch storm drains along Walnut Avenue. All construction activities must comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. This would include the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) incorporating Best
Management Practices (BMPs) for construction-related control of erosion and sedimentation contained in stormwater runoff.

I. Schools

The Project Site is located within the ESUSD. As part of the City's permitting process, a school fee will be paid to the District prior to the City's issuance of building permits.

J. Parks

Applicable park development impact fees will be paid at the time of building permit issuance.

K. Library Services

Applicable library development impact fees will be paid at the time of building permit issuance.
4.0 LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

4.1 DISTRIBUTION AND LOCATION OF LAND USE

SENIOR HOUSING COMMUNITY/MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) OPTION (OPTION 1)

Under this option, the southern 0.33 acre "tail" of the property which fronts on Walnut Avenue will be developed in accordance with the provisions of the R-3 (multi-family) zone and will be physically separated from the remainder of the Project Site.

There are two types of housing that will be developed under the Senior Housing Community: Assisted Living and Senior Residential which may be placed on the remaining 5.35 acres in substantial conformance with the approved concept site plan provided that the overall development does not exceed the total square footage and FAR set forth below and meets all of the other Development Standards set forth in Section 4.2.

The following graphical depiction provides a concept for the Senior Housing Community with Senior Housing that provides for 150 assisted and/or independent living units on the northern portion of the Project Site and 150 Senior Dwellings on the southern portion of the Project Site. The 0.33 acre R-3 (multi-family) "tail" piece is also shown (Exhibit 4). This concept may be modified in accordance with the procedures for minor and major modifications set forth in Section 4.3 below.
MIXED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPTION (OPTION 2)

Under this development option, multi-family development will front on East Imperial Avenue. The remainder of the property to the south would be developed with single-family lots that would be accessed from Walnut Avenue.

Exhibit 5 - Mixed Residential Unit Development Option 2 provides a concept of the Mixed Residential Unit Development. This concept may be modified in accordance with the procedures for minor and major modifications set forth in Section 4.3 below.

4.2 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Except as otherwise provided, this Specific Plan must be administered pursuant to the ESMC. The development standards set forth herein for both development options are intended to provide flexibility in the development while providing consistency with adjacent uses.

Where this Specific Plan does not specifically regulate, development must comply with the ESMC.
AFFORDABILITY

The City of El Segundo 2013 Housing Element identified a need for affordable housing to provide for low- and moderate income first-time homebuyers, senior citizens on fixed incomes, extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents, the disabled, military personnel, and the homeless segments of the population. As envisioned in the element and based on that need, for Option 1, fifteen (15) percent of the total units will be set aside as affordable units; for Option 2, ten (10) percent of the total units will be set aside as affordable units. Based on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), El Segundo is required to provide 69 additional housing units during the current housing cycle (2013-2021). The allocation of the 69 units is broken down into five categories as follows: 9 extremely low income households, 9 very low income households, 11 low income households, 12 moderate income households, and 28 above moderate income households.

The units in this project will be used to meet a portion of the need in the extremely low, very low, and low income household category which represent a proportional total of 31 percent, 31 percent, and 38 percent respectively, of the total RHNA allocation for the lower income categories (29 units). These same percentages were applied to the unit totals for this project. Thus, if 304 units are built under Option 1, a total of 46 units would be required as follows: 14 units (31% of the total 15%) for the extremely low income senior household category; 14 units (31% of the total 15%) for the very low income senior household category; and 18 units (38% of the total 15%) for the low income senior household category to be split equally between the assisted living and townhome/apartment units. If all 58 units are built under Option 2, a total of 6 units comprised of 2 units in each income category would be required (extremely low – 31% of the total 10%; very low – 31% of the total 10%; and low – 38% of the total 10%). The Developer must still provide 15% set aside for the total number of units constructed for Option 1 and 10% set aside for the total number of units constructed for Option 2 should fewer units than the maximum allowed be constructed. The units must be distributed in the same percentage ratios as specified above in the low, very low, and extremely low income categories. Percentages for the total number of units and for each income category must be calculated by rounding to the nearest whole number not to exceed the maximum required percentage. Any affordable housing units that are required based on the single-family component of Option 2 may be satisfied by developing the requisite number of units in other components of the project.

The developer must submit an income and verification monitoring plan to the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee before building permits are issued.
SENIOR HOUSING COMMUNITY/MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) OPTION
(OPTION 1)

The southern 0.33 acre "tail" of the Project Site will be developed in accordance with the existing provisions of the Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Zone. The remaining 5.35 acres will be developed in accordance with the following:

A. Permitted Uses

1. Senior Dwellings consisting of apartments or condominiums.
2. Senior Housing consisting of assisted and/or independent living units.
3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

B. Permitted Accessory Uses

1. Wireless communication facilities subject to ESMC Chapter 15-19.
2. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.
3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

C. Site Development Standards

1. Lot Coverage/Density

The Senior Housing Community development on the 5.35 acre parcel cannot exceed a total of 175,000 square feet combined, with a 0.75 total FAR. The exact mix of housing options is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with the Specific Plan but the development totals cannot exceed the maximum density analyzed in the EIR.

2. Lot Area

The minimum lot area is 15,000 gross square feet.

3. Height

No building or structure can exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height, with the exceptions of parapets and other auxiliary structures that cannot exceed forty-five (45) feet in height.
4. **Setbacks**

   a. *Front Yard along East Imperial Avenue*: 20-foot minimum.


   c. *Rear Yard*: 40-foot minimum between the southern side of the Specific Plan area and the R-3 uses to the south.

   d. *Between Uses*: The minimum setback between the Assisted Living on the north and the Senior Residential on the south side of the Specific Plan area is 10 feet to each property line.

5. **Lot Frontage**

   Each Lot must have a minimum frontage on a street of 75 feet.

6. **Building Area/Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

   The total net floor area of all buildings cannot exceed the total square footage of the property multiplied by 0.75.

7. **Off-Street Parking and Loading Spaces**

   Off-street parking and loading spaces, including parking for employees and visitors must be provided as follows:

   Senior Dwellings (Market Rate):
   - 1 space per studio/1 bedroom units
   - 2 spaces per 2 bedroom units

   Senior Dwellings (Affordable):
   - 0.5 space per studio/1 bedroom units
   - 1 spaces per 2 bedroom units

   Senior Housing Assisted Living Units (Market Rate):
   - 1 space per 2 units/2 beds

   Senior Housing Assisted Living Units (Affordable):
   - 1 space per 3 units/3 beds
D. Design Features

Assisted Living facilities will contain the following design features:

- Kitchen
- Dining Room
- Library
- Restrooms
- Exercise Area
- Recreational Facilities consisting of:
  - Game Playing Area
  - Pool
  - Open Space consisting of: landscaped courtyards and other passive recreational areas
  - Within each individual dwelling unit a kitchenette consisting of a minimum of refrigerator, sink and microwave

Senior Residential facilities will contain the following design features:

- Pool
- Community Room
- Lobby
- Mail Room
MIXED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPTION (OPTION 2)

A. Permitted Uses

1. Single-family units and/or multi-family housing units consisting of apartments, townhomes, or condominiums.

2. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

B. Permitted Accessory Uses

1. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.

2. Detached accessory buildings and structures, including private garages.

3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

C. Site Development Standards

1. Density

The Mixed Unit Development cannot exceed a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family units and thirty-four (34) multi-family units. The exact mix and layout of housing is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with the Specific Plan.

2. Lot Area

The minimum lot area for single family residential is 5,000 gross square feet.

The minimum lot area for multi-family residential is 7,000 gross square feet.

3. Height

There are substantial grade changes on this site from northwest to southeast, ranging in elevation from 146.5 feet to 107.5 feet, a change in elevation of 39 feet. Some of the buildings have been designed to have "internal" retaining walls within the building. These internal retaining walls range from a 2.8-foot retaining wall on two of the multi-family buildings to a 10-foot internal retaining wall on the Plan 1 single-family home. Refer to Exhibit 6 - Multi-Family Site Cross Section and Exhibit 8 - Single-Family Site Cross Section.

The building heights in this Specific Plan are measured from the finished grade to the average height of a sloped roof, or the highest point of the flat roof as applicable.
a. Multi-Family Homes

Multi-family residential dwelling units shall not exceed thirty-five feet six inches (35'-6") measured from the finished grade to the roof deck as shown in Exhibit 7 - Multi-Family Height Measurement. The parapet may extend a minimum of 42" above the roof deck. Roof structures to house stairway access to the roof deck are allowed per ESMC 15-2-3. Slope of roof on roof structures shall be no greater than shown on Exhibit 1 - Front Elevation of Multifamily Building (page 2). Average height of the sloped roof on the roof structure is forty-five (45') feet not to exceed forty-seven (47') feet at the highest point of the structure.

Exhibit 6 - Multi-Family Site Cross Section

Exhibit 7 - Multi-Family Height Measurement
b. Single-Family Homes - One-Story

A single-family home that is one-story at the front street elevation and maintains that same height to the rear of the home, even though the grade changes, shall be considered a one-story home for the purposes of modulation requirements of this Specific Plan. The maximum one-story height shall be eighteen feet (18') measured at the font elevation as shown in Exhibit 9 - One-Story Single-Family Height Measurement.
b. Single-Family Homes - Two-Story

Two-story single-family residential dwelling units shall not exceed twenty-six (26') feet and two stories maximum with the height measured from finished grade to the average of the highest sloped roof as shown in Exhibit 10 - Two-Story Single-Family Height Measurement.

Exhibit 10 - Two-Story Single-Family Height Measurement

4. Setbacks

a. Multi-Family Homes

(1) Front: The front yard shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty feet (20').

(2) Side Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback on each side of the lot of ten feet (10').

(3) Rear Yard (southern property line): Structures shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty-eight feet (28').

b. Single-Family Homes

(1) Front Yard: All front setbacks are measured from the property line (face of the curb). The front yard setback for living areas shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty feet (20'). Front yard setbacks for a two (2)-car garage shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty-four feet (24') measured from the garage door to the front property line. Porches or verandas not fully enclosed on three (3) sides (railings and/or columns permitted) may encroach four feet (4') into the front setback.

(2) Side Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback on each side of five feet (5'). Architectural building features, as defined by ESMC 15-1-6, may encroach into the side yard setback a maximum of two feet (2') per ESMC Section 15-2-7.
(3) Rear Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback of five feet (5'). Detached accessory structures shall maintain a minimum setback of three feet (3') from the rear property line on the first floor and five feet (5') on the second floor.

c. Property Fronting on Walnut Avenue

1) Front Yard: The front yard setback for living areas shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty feet (20'). Front yard setbacks for a two (2)-car garage shall maintain a minimum setback of twenty-four feet (24') measured from the garage door to the front property line. Porches or verandas not fully enclosed on three (3) sides (railings and/or columns permitted) may encroach four feet (4') into the front setback.

2) Side Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback of five feet (5') on the west side and twelve (12') feet measured to the property line (face of curb) on the east side. A ten (10') visibility triangle shall be provided at the entry from Walnut Avenue in accordance with the driveway visibility triangle shown on Figure 1 of ESMC Section 15-2-6. Architectural building features, as deemed by ESMC 15-1-6, may encroach into the side yard setback a maximum of two feet (2') per ESMC Section 15-2-7.

(3) Rear Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback of five feet (5'). Detached accessory structures shall maintain a minimum setback of three feet (3') from the rear property line on the first floor and five feet (5') on the second floor.
Projections into the side setback are permitted per ESMC Section 12-2-7

Exhibit 11 - Single-Family Setback Diagram
5. **Lot Frontage**

Each lot must have a minimum frontage on a street of 50 feet.

6. **Building Area/Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

The maximum net floor area permitted for single-family residential buildings is 0.58.

The minimum lot area per dwelling unit for the multi-family residential buildings is 2,112 square feet with a maximum of 34 units (20.7 units per acre).

7. **Off-Street Parking Spaces**

Each single-family home is provided a two (2)-car garage with minimum interior dimension of twenty feet by twenty feet (20'x20').

Each multi-family home is provided a two (2)-car garage with a minimum interior dimension of twenty feet by twenty feet (20'x20') except for one (1) plan that has two (2) one (1)-bay garages with a minimum interior dimension of ten feet by twenty feet (10'x20') for each space. Eighteen guest parking spaces shall be provided (0.5 parking space per unit with an additional handicapped parking space).

**GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR EITHER DEVELOPMENT OPTION**

A. **Landscaping**

Landscaping must be provided as required by the existing provisions of ESMC Chapters 15-15A and 15-2. If available and near the site and the City allows, the landscape could be irrigated by recycled water.

B. **Walls and Fences**

All walls and fences must comply with ESMC § 15-2-4. Decorative masonry, open work wrought iron and similar materials are permitted. The use of chain link and razor wire is prohibited.

C. **Access**

All development projects must provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. In addition, all development projects must provide pedestrian access between buildings.

D. **Signs**

Signs located in the Specific Plan area must comply with the requirements of ESMC Chapter 15-18.
E. **Sustainability Standards**

All homes will achieve a 15% improvement over the 2013 California Energy Code. Each home will accommodate the future installation of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure. Compliance with City residential noise insulation standards (ESMC 13-1-4) shall be met. As a standard, GreenGuard Certified insulation will be utilized.

F. **Design Standards**

1. **Building Modulation**

Building form and massing play a critical role in framing urban environments. Buildings should incorporate design and construction methods that add a human-scale to the building massing and three dimensional detailing that casts shadows and creates visual interest on the facade.

(a) Two-story Single-Family Modulation (refer to Exhibit 12):

(i) On 2-story homes, the front second floor must be setback at least 1-foot from the first floor.

(ii) The second floor shall be no more than 60 percent (60%) of the first floor footprint (uncovered decks are not part of this calculation).

(iii) Modulation of the second floor exterior perimeter walls must occur where the wall is visible from the street.

(iv) Second floor side walls visible from the street must have a varied setback.

(v) All second story side walls not visible from the street must include three of the following accents:
   - Windows,
   - Window trim,
   - Shutters,
   - Awnings,
   - Major change in grade,
   - Building off-sets; or
   - Other similar three-dimensional permanent exterior element of a building or structure that provides relief from large flat wall planes, breaks up building wall mass, and lends to the overall form, context and appearance of the building or structure.

(vi) Second floor rear walls must have an off-set a minimum of fifteen feet (15') refer to Exhibit 12.
Exhibit 12 - Two-Story Single-Family Home Modulation
(b) Multi-family Modulation:

(i) No plane facing a property line shall exceed twenty-four feet (24') horizontally without at least a one-foot (1') off-set horizontally or vertically for a minimum length of six feet (6').

2. All colors, textures, and materials on exterior elevation(s) must be coordinated to achieve a continuity of design throughout the 5.68-acre portion of the Project Site, regardless of whether the units are developed at the same time.

3. Single-family homes must have contrasting accent features that use at least two primary exterior building materials (including, without limitation, stucco, shingles, siding, stone, rock, and brick) and one exterior wall plane color and one trim color.

4. Multi-family buildings must have contrasting accent features that use at least two primary exterior building materials (including, without limitation, stucco and siding) and two exterior wall plane colors and one trim color.

5. All material and color changes must occur on an inside corner.

Exhibit 13 - Example of a Material Change at an Inside Corner

Outside Corners

Inside Corner

Outside Corner

Inside Corner

Outside Corners

Material change only permitted at an inside corner
6. All garage doors shall be enhanced. To provide variety for the single-family street scene garage doors shall be varied. This variety could include the same door with or without windows, or with different number of panels or trims.

Exhibit 14 - Example of Garage Door Variety

7. Building materials must be of non-reflective coatings and glazings and windows must use low-reflectivity glass.
8. All material finishes should express permanence and quality:

(a) Stucco finish should project high quality and be appropriate to the architectural style. "Heavy Lace" and "Spanish Texture" stucco finishes are prohibited.

*Exhibit 15 - Examples of Stucco Quality*
(b) Manufactured stone veneers shall have a texture and color that mimics natural stone and be of exceptional quality.

Stone with poor application of color example

Unnatural looking stone from a worn out mold with poor detailing

Unnatural looking stone from a old & deteriorating mold example

Stone corner application example

Stacked stone application example

Grouted stone application example

Exhibit 16 - Examples of Stone Veneer Quality

9. Plans must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or other Planning Department designee for compliance with these Design Standards. If the Director or designee finds that such plans are non compliant, an applicant may appeal that decision in accordance with the ESMC.
G. **Phasing**

The housing on the entire 5.68-acre Project Site may be developed in one or more phases.

H. **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

Option 1, the Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) project, must provide two bulletin boards, display cases or kiosks displaying transportation information located where it is visible to the greatest number of residents and employees (one within the assisted living development and one within the senior residential development). Information in the area must include, without limitation, the following:

1. Current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site;
2. Telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators;
3. Ridesharing promotional material supplied by commuter-oriented organizations;
4. Bicycle route and facility information including regional/local bicycle maps and bicycle safety information; and
5. A list of facilities available for carpoolers, vanpoolers, bicyclists, transit riders, residents and pedestrians at the site.

4.3 **MODIFICATIONS**

The following requirements apply to Option 1 and to Option 2:

A. **Minor Modifications/Administrative Approvals**

The Developer may make minor changes to the Project and Project Approvals ("Minor Modifications") without amending this Specific Plan upon the administrative approval of the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, provided that such modifications are consistent with the Development Standards, Applicable Rules and Project Approvals.

B. **Major Modifications**

Unless such modification is approved in accordance with subsection A above or is a use approved subject to an Administrative Use Permit, any proposed modification to the Project which results in any of the following does not constitute a Minor Modification but constitute a Major Modification and require an amendment to this Specific Plan:

1. Any decrease in the required building setbacks;
2. Any increase in the total developable square footage or FAR of the entire Project Site;
3. Any increase in the permitted height of buildings or structures on the Property;

4. Any decrease in the minimum required lot area;

5. Any decrease in the minimum required lot frontage;

6. Any change in use to a use which is not permitted herein;

7. Any deviation from the uses and development standards or limitations set forth in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2 of this Specific Plan, except to the extent these Sections specifically provide for the Council or the Director or designee to approve of such changes;

8. Any material modification to Developer's obligation to provide LEED certification, or such other equivalent standard as determined by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee for the Project; or

9. Any material modification that requires modifications to the EIR other than an Addendum.

10. Other than the Major Modifications listed above, all other modifications to the Project are considered "Minor Modifications."
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION

5.1 FINANCING AND MAINTENANCE OF IMPROVEMENTS

The financing and maintenance plan for 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan will ensure the timely completion of public facilities, utilities, and other necessary capital improvements as well as the proper maintenance of these facilities. Upon acquisition of permits, it will be the responsibility of the developer to pay for all improvements associated with this Specific Plan and all other approvals related with this Plan as described in Table 1: Financing and Maintenance Plan.

5.1.1 HOA PROTECTION OF HOME VALUE

The developer will establish a Homeowners Association (HOA) to protect, maintain, and enhance this community for perpetuity. The HOA will manage the long-term maintenance of items on site not maintained by the City. The City will have an easement over the internal circulation system for access and maintenance of facilities that will be maintained by the City. The City easement will also be utilized for emergency services and solid waste collection. All wastewater facilities on site must be maintained by the HOA.

The HOA will also maintain the on-site storm drain, lighting, and landscape and irrigation systems located on the common lots as defined by the tentative map. The front yard areas that face the loop road are also HOA maintained. Private areas to be maintained by the Homeowner include areas located behind fences and walls. Any revisions to front yard landscaping must be approved by the HOA.

Table 1: Financing and Maintenance Plan indicates the parties responsible for construction, financing, and maintaining the public improvements proposed by the Specific Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Facility</th>
<th>Party(ies) Executing Construction</th>
<th>Party(ies) Financing Construction</th>
<th>Party(ies) Responsible for Operation and Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Facilities</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Homeowners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Water</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Water Facilities</td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Streetscape</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Area Improvements</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Area Improvements</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 PLAN REVIEW

#### 5.2.1 OVERVIEW

In order to develop a project that is in conformance with the uses, density and FAR approved in this Specific Plan, a Site Plan Review ("SPR") application must be filed with the Department of Planning and Building Safety. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the approved conceptual plans.

#### 5.2.2 APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW - CONTENTS

The Site Plan Review Application must be submitted in conformance with applicable City application requirements and must include all information deemed necessary by the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee to address site plan review criteria. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the approved conceptual plans.

#### 5.2.3 SITE PLAN REVIEW – PROCEDURE

A. The Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee must review an application to ensure there is consistency with the Specific Plan within 30 days after it is submitted.

B. CEQA Review, if required, must be conducted within the time frames set forth in the Public Resources Code and the California Code of Regulations.
C. The Site Plan Review must be timely scheduled for public hearing before the Planning Commission, which date cannot exceed 30 days after the completion of the public review period of the environmental documentation, if any, or within 30 days from the date the application is deemed complete if no further environmental review is required. The Planning Commission must render its decision in writing, either approving, approving with conditions, or denying the Site Plan Review application, stating the reasons for such action. The decision of the Planning Commission is final unless appealed to the City Council.

D. Any aggrieved person may appeal the Planning Commission’s decision to the City Council. Such appeal must be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Building Safety within ten days after the date of the written decision by the Planning Commission. Upon receiving such an appeal and the payment of the appropriate filing fee, the matter must be scheduled for consideration by the City Council not more than 45 days after the date of receipt of the appeal.

E. The Site Plan is valid for two years from the date of approval. If construction has not commenced within such time, but the applicant has diligently pursued the project plan review process, the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee may extend the precise plan of design for up to one additional year.

F. Subsequent to the approval of the Site Plan, the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee may approve minor changes in the Site Plan or the conditions thereof if he finds that there are practical reasons for such changes, that such changes do not substantially vary from the previously approved site plan and applicable City codes and that such changes do not involve deviations from the design’s intent.

5.2.4 SITE PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA

The purpose of the Site Plan Review procedure is to ensure that the development provides a cohesive visual identity and coordinated design character for the Specific Plan area of high quality. The overall coordinated design character must be expressed in the site planning, architecture, landscaping, lighting, and signage. The architectural design is to be compatible in character, massing and materials consistent with the conceptual plan depicted in this Plan. The architectural design must provide a residential character that complements the surrounding uses and integrates the residential uses with the neighborhood to ensure that the project does not have the appearance of a suburban subdivision with a single uniform architectural building design. A minimum of two distinct architectural styles and building designs must be used for the single-family uses and two distinct architectural style and building designs must be used for the multi-family uses. The site design should maximize setback distances of buildings and parking spaces from the existing surrounding residential development to the east, west and south to the extent feasible, minimize the reduction of on-street parking in relationship to driveway placement, and distribute the placement of required landscaping throughout parking areas.

In approving the Site Plan Review the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal, must consider the following factors:

A. The dimensions, shape and orientation of the parcel;

B. The placement of buildings and structures on the parcel;
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C. The height, setbacks, and bulk of buildings;
D. The building materials and design;
E. The distance between buildings or structures;
F. The location, number and layout of off-street parking and loading spaces;
G. The internal traffic patterns and pedestrian safety features;
H. The location, distribution, amount and type of landscaping materials and the sustainability of the landscaping material with the El Segundo climate in compliance with the applicable climate zone;
I. The placement, height and direction of illumination of light standards;
J. The location, number, size and height of signs;
K. The location, height and materials of walls, fences or hedges; and
L. The location and method of screening refuse and storage areas, roof equipment, pipes, vents, utility equipment and all equipment not contained in the main buildings of the development.

5.2.5 Approval Criteria

The Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal, will approve the Site Plan if it finds that the site plan, architecture and landscape design, with conditions if necessary are consistent with the Project Description and development standards set forth herein.

5.3 General Administration

Unless regulated by this Specific Plan, development will be administered and enforced by the City in accordance with the ESMC. This Specific Plan supersedes any conflicts with ESMC zoning regulations.

A. The Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee may grant administrative use permits in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-22.

B. The Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee may make other administrative determinations using the same procedures set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-22.

C. The Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee may grant adjustments and administrative adjustments in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-24.
5.4 AMENDMENT

In accordance with the Government Code §§ 65450-65457, Specific Plans must be prepared, adopted and amended in the same manner as General Plans except that Specific Plans may be adopted by resolution or by ordinance.

This plan may be amended as necessary by ordinance. Said amendment or amendments do not require a concurrent General Plan amendment unless the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee determines that the proposed amendment would substantially affect General Plan goals, policies, objectives or programs.
RECORDING REQUESTED BY
AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

CITY CLERK
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
350 Main Street
El Segundo, California 90245

Exempt from recorder’s fees
Pursuant to Govt. Code §6103

FIRST AMENDMENT OF
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
BY AND BETWEEN
THE CITY OF EL SEGUNDO
AND EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
(540 E. IMPERIAL AVENUE SITE)

This First Amendment of Development Agreement ("First Amendment") is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2016, by and between the CITY OF EL SEGUNDO ("City"), a municipal corporation and the EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ("Developer").

RECITALS

A.          City and Developer entered into that certain Development Agreement dated May 4, 2012 ("Development Agreement"), which Development Agreement was recorded on May 30, 2012, in the Official Records of Los Angeles County as Document No. 20120798461. Capitalized terms used herein but not otherwise defined shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Development Agreement.

B.          Section 4.6.3 of the Development Agreement provides that any proposed modification to the Project that would decrease required building setbacks, increase total developable square footage or FAR, increase building heights, decrease minimum required lot areas, deviate from certain development standards or materially modify the obligation to provide LEED certification for the Project, constitutes a "Major Modification" that requires an amendment to the Development Agreement.

C.          Concurrent with consideration of this First Amendment, City is processing an Amendment to the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan ("Specific Plan Amendment") and an amendment to Vesting Tentative Map No. _____ ("VTM Amendment") for purposes of modifying building setbacks, developable square footage and FAR, building height, minimum lot area, applicable development standards, and LEED certification/energy efficiency requirements, among other things. City and Developer desire to enter into this First Amendment in order to
provide consistency with and to establish vested rights to develop the Project in accordance with the Specific Plan Amendment and the VTM Amendment.

AGREEMENT

1. Amendment of Development Agreement. The following sections and exhibits of the Development Agreement are hereby amended as follows:

   A. The definition of “Applicable Rules” set forth in Section 1 is hereby amended to also include the Specific Plan Amendment.

   B. The definition of “Project Approvals” set forth in Section 1 is hereby amended to also include the Specific Plan Amendment and the VTM Amendment.

   C. All references in subsections 2.3 and 4.6.3 to the “540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan” are hereby deleted and replaced with “540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, as amended by the Specific Plan Amendment.”

   D. All references in subsection 4.6.4 to the “Specific Plan” are hereby deleted and replaced with “540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, as amended by the Specific Plan Amendment.”

   E. A new Section 4.17 is hereby added as follows:

   “4.17 Building Inspections. The City agrees to use its best efforts to expedite the building inspection process for the Project. The Director or his designee will endeavor to schedule building inspections within two business days of Developer’s request. In the event that City is unable to perform such duties within the time frame outlined in this Agreement, the City agrees that Developer may hire and pay a consultant to perform such duties, with the express written consent of the City, not to be unreasonably withheld.”

   F. A new subsection, Subsection 5.3.3, is hereby added as follows:

   “5.3.3 To ensure that the above-referenced units designated as affordable remain affordable to low, very low and extremely low households, Developer must enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy issued for the Project. The Affordable Housing Agreement must be recorded with the Los Angeles County Register-Recorder’s office.”

   G. Section 5.8 is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

   “The Project shall be developed in compliance with the energy efficiency standards set forth in the Specific Plan Amendment.”

   H. A new section, Section 5.9, is hereby added as follows:
“5.9 Public Benefit Contributions. In exchange for the valuable development rights secured by this Development Agreement, Developer agrees to make the following contributions, in the aggregate amount of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000):

1. Developer will contribute Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) to the City, with Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000) contributed to the City before the first Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the first Single-Family Detached Unit, and Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000) contributed to the City before the twenty-fourth Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the final Single-Family Detached Unit. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the total amount of $500,000 must be contributed to the City no later than five years from the date of the First Amendment.

2. Developer will contribute One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000) to the City’s Aquatic Fund, to be contributed to the City no later than 60 days from the date of the First Amendment.

3. Developer will contribute One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000) to El Segundo Little League (Challenger Division), to be contributed to the City no later than 60 days from the date of the First Amendment.

4. Developer will contribute Three Hundred Thousand Dollars ($300,000) to reimburse the City for its estimated costs of administering and enforcing the affordable housing component of the Project, with One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($150,000) to be contributed to the City before the first Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the first affordable unit and One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($150,000) to be contributed to the City before the sixth Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the final affordable unit. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the total amount of $300,000 must be contributed to the City no later than five years from the date of the First Amendment."

1. Exhibit “D” of the Development Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with Exhibit “D-1” attached hereto and incorporated herein.

2. Good Faith Compliance. This First Amendment shall constitute the City’s Periodic Review pursuant to Section 8.1 of the Development Agreement and City’s determination that Developer is in substantial compliance with the terms and provisions of the Development Agreement.

3. Effect of Amendment. Except as expressly provided in this First Amendment, the Development Agreement shall not be amended or otherwise modified. In the event there is a conflict between the terms of the Development Agreement and the terms of this First Amendment, the terms provided in this First Amendment shall control. On and after the date hereof, each reference in the Development Agreement to “this Agreement,”
“hereunder,” “hereof,” “hereto,” “herein,” or words of like import referring to the Development Agreement shall mean and be a reference to the Development Agreement as amended by this First Amendment.

4. **Recordation.** This First Amendment shall be recorded with the County Recorder of the County of Los Angeles by the City Clerk of City.

5. **Counterparts.** This First Amendment may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which, taken together, shall constitute one fully executed original.

[Signatures on following page]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Developer and City of El Segundo have executed this First Amendment on the date first above written.

CITY:

CITY OF EL SEGUNDO, a municipal corporation

By: ____________________________
   Suzanne Fuentes, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_______________________________
Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney

DEVELOPER:
EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: ____________________________
   Its: ____________________________
A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California )
County of ________________ )

On ________________, before me, __________________________________, a Notary Public, personally appeared __________________________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal,

Signature ____________________________________________

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California )
County of ________________ )

On ________________, before me, __________________________________, a Notary Public, personally appeared __________________________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature ____________________________________________
EXHIBIT “D-1”

540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN
HOUSING SET ASIDE – 5% Option 1/10% Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1 (289 Total Units) 15 total</th>
<th>OPTION 2 (58 Total Units) 6 units total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living</td>
<td>Units Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extremely Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15% Set Aside</td>
<td>7 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Condominiums/ Apartments</th>
<th>Units Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extremely Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Very Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15% Set Aside</td>
<td>8 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit totals shown by income category in this table represent the proportional percentage of the City’s total Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation for the lower income categories shown. In this case, the RHNA allocation for the combined lower income categories is 71 total units. The Extremely Low income category represents 31 percent of the total allocation; the Very Low income category represents 31 percent of the total allocation and the Low Income category represents 38 percent of the total RHNA allocation. These same percentages were applied to the unit totals for this project.
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-CERTIFIED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 890 RELATED TO THE 540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE PROJECT, APPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 1154 AND AMENDED SUBDIVISION NO. 16-01 FOR VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 71582 AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE SAME

The City Council of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares that:

A. On January 26, 2012, the El Segundo Planning Commission approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-890, General Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 10-01, Specific Plan 10-03, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06, Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision No. 10-01 for Vesting Tentative Map Nos. 71410 and 71582 to allow for the construction of one of two possible conceptual options on a 5.65-acre surplus school site. Option 1 consisted of a three-story, 150 unit assisted living complex and a 154-unit senior apartment/condominium complex. Option 2 consisted of 34 multi-family dwelling units taking access from Imperial Avenue, and 24 single-family dwelling units taking access from Walnut Avenue, for a total of 58 units;

B. On March 20, 2012, the City Council approved the project and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR);

C. On May 1, 2016, D.R. Horton Homes CA2 Inc. (the applicant), filed an application with approval from the El Segundo Unified School District (the property owner) for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 1154), Specific Plan Amendment No. 16-01 for Specific Plan No. 10-03, Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No 10-03, and Amended Subdivision No. 16-01 for Vesting Tentative Map No. 71582 for 25 lots, to modify the Option 2 portion of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, to allow construction of a 58-unit mixed residential development;

D. The applications were reviewed by the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department for, in part, consistency with the General Plan and conformity with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC");

E. In addition, the City reviewed the project’s environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§
21000, et seq., “CEQA”), the regulations promulgated thereunder (14 Cal. Code of Regulations §§15000, et seq., the “CEQA Guidelines”), and the City’s Environmental Guidelines (City Council Resolution No. 3805, adopted March 16, 1993);

F. An Addendum to the previously-certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA Guidelines § 15164;

G. The Planning and Building Safety Department completed its review and scheduled a public hearing regarding the application before the Planning Commission for September 8, 2016;

H. On September 8, 2016, the Commission held a public hearing to receive public testimony and other evidence regarding the applications including, without limitation, information provided to the Commission by City staff and public testimony, and representatives of D.R. Horton Homes CR2 Inc.;

I. This Resolution and its findings are made based upon the testimony and evidence presented to the Commission at its September 8, 2016 hearing including, without limitation, the staff report submitted by the Planning and Building Safety Department; and

J. Concurrently with this resolution, the City Council has also introduced and is expected to adopt an ordinance for Specific Plan Amendment No 16-01 for Specific Plan No 10-03 and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-02 for Development Agreement No. 10-02.

SECTION 2: Factual Findings and Conclusions. The Council finds that the following facts exist:

A. The subject property is located at 540 East Imperial Avenue in the northwest portion of the City of El Segundo;

B. The property is comprised of six lots and the total site area is on the block bounded by East Imperial Avenue to the north; Walnut Avenue to the south, Sheldon Street to the west, and McCarthy Court to the east;

C. The surrounding land uses are primarily single-family and multi-family residential uses in the Single-Family Residential (R-1) and Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Zones to the east, west and south, with a mortuary located on one parcel in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) Zone located at the northeast corner of East Imperial Avenue and Sheldon Street, west of the site. Land uses north of the site include a community dog park within the corporate boundary of the City of El Segundo and LAX
across Imperial Avenue in the City of Los Angeles;

D. The proposed project for the property at 540 East Imperial Avenue consists of an amendment to the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan for the construction of a 58-unit mixed residential development;

E. The subject site is irregular in shape with 455 feet of street frontage on East Imperial Avenue and a total lot area of 5.65 acres;

F. The subject site is developed with eight single-story brick buildings (22,488 square-feet total) that once served as administrative offices and classrooms for the former Imperial Avenue Elementary School;

G. Vehicular access to the multi-family portion of the property (northern front portion of the site) would be from East Imperial Avenue, while primary vehicular access for the single-family portion of the property would be from Walnut Avenue;

H. The proposed Amended Development Agreement grants the City public benefits in exchange for certain development rights and requires the applicant enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before the first certificate of occupancy is issued for the project;

I. The Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582 would subdivide the property into 25 lots plus one lettered lot; 24 single-family lots and one lot for condominium purposed for the multi-family units.

SECTION 3: Environmental Assessment. The City Council makes the following environmental findings:

A. The City completed an Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project. Under CEQA, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR is appropriate if minor changes or additions to the EIR are necessary to reflect the proposed modifications to the project in the environmental analysis and none of the conditions described in section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred (CEQA Guidelines §15164). Generally, the conditions described in Section 15162 have not occurred if the proposed modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines §15164[c]); however, an addendum must be considered by the decision-making body before making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines §15164[d]).

B. This Addendum to the previously-certified EIR demonstrates that the
environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation measures identified in the 2012 EIR for Environmental Assessment No. EA-890 remain substantively unchanged despite the proposed project revisions. It supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the previous Environmental Impact Report. The mitigation measures listed in the certified EIR for EA 890, are still sufficient to reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

C. The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC) for the following EA 890 impact areas:

1. Air Quality - Construction. Temporary construction activities for either Option 1 or Option 2 would violate air quality standards for VOC's even with full implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM4.1-1 through MM4.1-16).

2. Noise - Operation. While neither project (Option 1 or Option 2) would result in a substantial ongoing increase in exterior noise levels during operation, both project Options would increase the permanent, noise sensitive residential population on the project site even with full implementation of MM4.3-6 and MM4.3-7 because of the site's proximity to LAX.

This Addendum found these impacts were not made worse by the project modifications. Therefore, the Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC), adopted by Council Resolution 4772 and Ordinance 1469, will remain.

SECTION 4: General Plan and Specific Plan. If approved, the proposed project conforms to the City's General Plan and the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan as follows:

A. Following a Specific Plan Amendment, the General Plan Land Use Designation of the project site will remain unchanged; 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (EIASP). This designation is intended for senior housing consisting of apartments or condominiums, senior housing consisting of assisted and/or independent living units, single-family and/or multi-family housing units consisting of market rate and affordable apartments or condominiums. As conditioned, the proposed project Option 1 or Option 2 would be compatible with the General Plan.

B. The General Plan contains a number of relevant Goals, Objectives, and Policies in the Land Use Element. Implementation of the proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy LU3-2.1 to "promote high quality Multi-Family Residential developments with ample open space,
leisure and recreational facilities.” If approved, the development will be built and maintained in accordance with these requirements and regulations and the requirements and regulations of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.

C. The proposed project is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU3-3 to “encourage the development of viable attractive neighborhoods, free from blight and deterioration” in that the project will provide a new housing development on a site that is currently developed with eight vacant and deteriorating single-story brick structures formerly used as classrooms and offices for the Imperial Avenue Elementary School.

D. The proposed project is consistent with Housing Element Goal 2 to “Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate income households;” Housing Element Policy 2.1 to “establish and maintain land use controls to accommodate the housing needs of the elderly, disabled, and other special needs households; and Housing Element Policy 2.2 to “facilitate the creation of affordable home ownership opportunities for extremely low, very low, and low income households; in that the project will provide much need housing for all income levels with a 15 percent set aside for extremely low, very low and low income households in Option 1, and a 10% set aside for Option 2.

E. The proposed project is consistent with certain Circulation Element Objectives and Policies based upon a Traffic Study performed for the project. The Traffic Study determined that the proposed project Option 1 would generate 956 daily trips with 46 morning peak hour, and 83 evening peak hour trips. Option 2 would generate 428 daily trips, 34 in the morning peak hour and 42 in the evening peak hour. Additional trips generated by the project will be mitigated by a traffic mitigation fee. The Traffic Study found that neither Option 1 nor Option 2 of the proposed project would significantly impact any study intersections; therefore, no mitigation measures are required or proposed for the project. Consequently, the project is consistent with the following Circulation Element Objectives and Policies:

1. C1-1 to “provide a roadway system that accommodates the City’s existing and projected land use and circulation needs.”

2. C1-1.2 to “pursue implementation of all Circulation Element policies such that all Master Plan roadways are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service.”

3. C1-1.14 to “require a full evaluation of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed new development prior to project
approval. Further, require the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures prior to, or in conjunction with, project development. Mitigation measures may include new roadway links on segments that would connect the new development to the existing roadway system, intersection improvements, and other measures. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer."

4. C2-1.3 to “encourage new developments in the City to participate in the development of the citywide system of pedestrian walkways and require participation funded by the project developer where appropriate.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City Standards are incorporated into the design of this project.

5. C2-1.4 to “ensure the installation of sidewalks on all future arterial widening or new construction projects, to establish a continuous and convenient link for pedestrians. Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project as required by the Department of Public Works.

6. 3-1.1 to “require all new development to mitigate project-related impacts on the existing and future circulation system such that all Master Plan roadways and intersections are upgraded and maintained at acceptable levels of service through implementation of all applicable Circulation Element policies. Mitigation measures shall be provided by or paid for by the project developer."

7. C3-1.8 to “require the provision of adequate pedestrian and bicycle access for new development projects through the development review process.” Full sidewalk and curb and gutter to City standards are incorporated into the design of this project that will provide adequate pedestrian access. Adequate bicycle access will be available to the site.

8. C3-2.1 to “ensure the provision of sufficient on-site parking in all new development.” The proposed project is required to provide on-site parking at the following ratios: 1) 2 garage spaces for each unit and 1 additional space for dwelling units exceeding 3,000 square feet of gross floor area, 2) 2.53 per multi-family unit.

F. The proposed project is consistent with Noise Element Policy N1-1.9 that requires “review of all new development projects in the City for conformance with California Airport Noise Regulations and California Noise Insulation Standards (Code of California Regulations, Title 24) to ensure interior noise will not exceed acceptable levels” and Program N1-1.9A that requires “all new habitable residential construction in areas of
the City with an annual CNEL of 60 dBA or higher shall include all mitigation measures necessary to reduce interior noise levels to minimum state standards. Post construction acoustical analysis shall be performed to demonstrate compliance.”

G. The proposed project is consistent with Noise Element Policy N1-2.1 that requires “all new projects to meet the City’s Noise Ordinance Standards as a condition of building permit approval” and Program N1-2.1A that “addresses noise impacts in all environmental documents for discretionary approval projects, to ensure that noise sources meet City Noise Ordinance standards” in that the DEIR addressed noise sources that include: mechanical and electrical equipment and truck loading areas as specified in Program N1-2.1A.

H. The proposed project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy CN5-1 in that the project will preserve the character and quality of existing neighborhood; Conservation Element Policy CN5-6 to encourage that any new landscaped areas respect and incorporate distinctive elements of the community landscape; Conservation Element Policy CN5-8 to increase the quantity of plant material; and Conservation Element Policy CN5-9 to increase the diversity of plant species.

SECTION 5: Subdivision. The City Council cannot make any of the findings for denial set forth in ESMC § 14-1-6 for the following reasons:

A. The proposed map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans as specified in Government Code § 65451. As set forth in Section 4 of this Resolution, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan and it is consistent with the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. Vesting Tentative Map (VTM) No. 71582 for project Option 2 proposes 25 new lots. The proposed lots vary in size and meet the minimum lot sizes stated in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.

B. The design of the proposed subdivision is consistent with applicable general and specific plans. As set forth in Section 4, this project meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan.

C. The site is physically suitable for the proposed type of development in that, after the proposed grading, the areas outside the required setbacks on each individual lot will be relatively flat. The proposed lots meet the size and dimension requirements to allow the subdivision of the existing parcel. The previous land use and zoning designation for the property was Planned Residential Development. The new 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan continues the residential use at a mix that is more in line with the surrounding single-family and multi-family residential uses.
D. The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development. The proposed project involves a subdivision of a 5.65-acre parcel into a 25-lot subdivision (Option 2).

E. The design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements is unlikely to cause substantial damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat. The proposed project site is a former elementary school located in an urbanized area surrounded by existing single-family and multi-family residences. There are no fish or wildlife habitats on the site that could be damaged by the proposed subdivision or new development.

F. The design of the subdivision will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision. The proposed subdivision is not anticipated to conflict with any known easements located at, or near the property. No easements have been identified on the subject site.

SECTION 6: Approvals. Based on the foregoing and subject to the conditions listed on the attached Exhibit “A,” the City Council hereby:

A. Adopts the Addendum to the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report for Environmental Assessment No. 890 including the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), attached hereto as Exhibit C;

B. Approves Environmental Assessment No EA 1154 and Subdivision Amendment No. 16-01 for Vesting Tentative Map No. 71582; and

C. Authorizes the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the applicant, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office.

SECTION 7: Reliance on Record. Each and every one of the findings and determinations in this Resolution are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire record relating to the project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of the City Council in all respects and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 8: Limitations. The City Council’s analysis and evaluation of the project is based on the best information currently available. It is inevitable that in evaluating a project that absolute and perfect knowledge of all possible aspects of the project will not exist. One of the major limitations on analysis of the project is the City Council’s lack of knowledge of future events. In all instances, best efforts have been made to form accurate assumptions. Somewhat related to this are the limitations on the City's ability to solve what are in effect regional, state, and national problems and issues. The City
must work within the political framework within which it exists and with the limitations inherent in that framework.

SECTION 9: Summaries of Information. All summaries of information in the findings, which precede this section, are based on the substantial evidence in the record. The absence of any particular fact from any such summary is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on that fact.

SECTION 10: Concurrently with this resolution, the City Council has also introduced and is expected to adopt an ordinance approving Specific Plan Amendment No 16-01 for Specific Plan No 10-03 and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-02 for Development Agreement No. 10-02. In the event that the ordinance is not adopted by the City Council, this resolution will be null and void and of no effect.

SECTION 11: Except as otherwise stated in Section 10, this Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption and will remain effective until superseded by a subsequent resolution.

SECTION 12: A copy of this Resolution must be mailed to D.R. Horton Homes CA2, Inc. and the El Segundo Unified School District, and to any other person requesting a copy.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of September, 2016.

__________________________
Suzanne Fuentes, Mayor

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) SS
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO )

I, Tracy Weaver, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. ____ was duly passed, approved and adopted by said City Council at a regular meeting held on the ____ day of September, 2016, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark D. Hensley, City Attorney
Attachment #2A

CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ____

Exhibit A

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

In addition to all applicable provisions of the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), the El Segundo Unified School District, agrees to comply with the following provisions as conditions for the City of El Segundo's approval for Environmental Assessment (EA No. 1154), General Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Specific Plan No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 40-01, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06, Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision 10-01 for Vesting Tentative Map Nos. 71410 and 71582 Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02 ("Project Conditions"). The proposed revisions to these conditions of approval are illustrated with strikethrough for existing language that is proposed for elimination and underlined for proposed new language.

Planning and Building Safety Department

1. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit plans demonstrating substantial compliance with the plans and conditions of approval on file with the Planning and Building Safety Department. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved, including the site plan, floor plan, elevations, landscaping and materials, must be referred to the Director of Planning and Building Safety to determine whether the Planning Commission should review the proposed modification.

2. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must obtain all the necessary approvals, licenses and permits and pay all the appropriate fees as required by the City.

3. The applicant must comply with all mitigation measures identified in the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Project. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) was prepared as part of the environmental review for the project and is attached as Exhibit C to this Resolution. The mitigation measures of the MMRP are incorporated into these conditions of approval by reference. All mitigation measures and conditions of approval must be listed on the plans submitted for plan check and the plans for which a building permit is issued.

4. Any changes to the colors and materials of the exterior façade of the building must be in compliance with the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Amendment Section 4.2(F) Development
Standards and approved to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

5. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit final landscaping and irrigation plans to the Planning and Building Safety Department and the Parks and Recreation Department for review and approval to demonstrate compliance with the City's Water Conservation regulations and Guidelines for Water Conservation in Landscaping (ESMC §§ 10-2-1, et seq., Chapter 15-5A). The plant materials used in landscaping must be compatible with the El Segundo climate pursuant to Sunset Western Garden Book's Zone 24 published by Sunset Books, Inc., Revised and Updated 2001 edition, which is available for review at the Planning and Building Safety Department. Additionally, the landscaping and irrigation must be completely installed before the City issues a final Certificate of Occupancy. Additionally, the final landscaping and irrigation plans must comply with the following:

- Reclaimed water must be used as the water source to irrigate landscaped areas, if feasible. To that end, dual water connections must be installed to allow for landscaping to be irrigated by reclaimed water, if feasible.

- Efficient irrigation systems must be installed which minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water which will reach plant roots (e.g., drip irrigation, automatic sprinklers equipped with moisture sensors).

- Automatic sprinkler systems must be set to irrigate landscaping during early morning hours or during the evening to reduce water losses from evaporation. Sprinklers must also be reset to water less often in cooler months and during the rainfall season so that water is not wasted by excessive landscaping irrigation.

6. Selection of drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties must be used to reduce irrigation water consumption, in compliance with ESMC §§ 10-2-1, et seq.

7. The applicant must provide a sufficient number of bicycle racks to accommodate storing at least 8 bicycles (Option 1).

8. Employees must be provided current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site; telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators; ridesharing
9. Trash and recycling enclosures must be provided and shown on the site plan that are sufficiently large enough to store the necessary bins required for the regular collection of commercial solid waste and recyclable materials. The site plan with the location and dimensions of the trash and recycling enclosure and an elevation view of the enclosure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval before the City issues building permits. Separate trash and recycling facilities must be provided for each of the three components of Option 1 (senior housing, assisted living and multi-family). Separate trash and recycling enclosures must be provided for the multi-family portion of Option 2.

10. Ground level mechanical equipment, refuse collectors, storage tanks, generators, and other similar facilities must be screened from view with dense landscaping and walls of materials and finishes compatible with the overall design of the project and any ancillary buildings.

11. Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare.

12. The building must be designed to comply with all ESMC standards for the attenuation of interior noise.

13. Before the City issues a Certificate of Occupancy the applicant must provide the Planning and Building Safety Department a status report on the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification process that includes the GBCI scorecard. The Director of Planning and Building Safety will determine if the items identified on the scorecard and report, show a good faith effort to obtain LEED certification and warrant release of this condition. Within one month of receiving LEED certification, the applicant must furnish proof of certification to the Planning and Building Safety Department. All homes must achieve a 15% improvement over the standards established in the 2013 California Energy Standard Codes.
14. The applicant agrees to set aside 15% of the total number of units constructed for Option 1. The units must be distributed as follows: 31% of the total 15% for the extremely low income senior household category; 31% of the 15% for the very low income senior household category; and 38% of the 15% for the low income senior household category to be split equally between the assisted living and condominium/apartment units. Percentages for the total number of units and for each income category must be calculated by rounding to the nearest whole number not to exceed the maximum required percentage. The Developer must submit an income verification monitoring plan to the Director of Planning and Building Safety before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

15. The applicant agrees to set aside 10% of the total number of units constructed for Option 2. The units must be distributed as follows: 31% of the total 10% for the extremely low income senior household category; 31% of the 10% for the very low income senior household category; and 38% of the 10% for the low income senior household category to be split equally between the multi-family condominium/apartment units. Any affordable housing units that are required based on the single-family component of Option 2 may be satisfied by developing the requisite number of units in other components of the project. Percentages for the total number of units and for each income category must be calculated by rounding to the nearest whole number not to exceed the maximum required percentage. The Developer and the City must enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement, which will include submit an income verification monitoring plan, to the Director of Planning and Building Safety before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. The project will fulfill the affordability requirements set forth in the Specific Plan by providing a total of 6 affordable units to qualified households, which represents 10% of the total 58 units. The units will be provided in the multi-family section of the project and will be evenly distributed throughout the entire project by providing one unit in each multi-family building. The “affordable” units must be similar in exterior appearance, interior appointments, and configuration and basic amenities (such as storage space and outdoor living areas) to the “market rate” units in the proposed project. Further, covenants and agreements must be recorded as to the affordable units, which would ensure the units remain affordable for a term of 20 years, concurrently with the recordation of the final map or the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of the building.

16. The applicant must provide a marketing implementation plan that includes, without limitation, notification to residents of El Segundo
regarding the availability of affordable housing in the project, eligibility requirements, application requirements, and access to application materials to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

17. A minimum of two building materials must be provided in each component of each project option (Option 1 and Option 2) to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

18. The project must meet all design criteria of the Specific Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

**Building Division Conditions**

19. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must submit a geotechnical/soils report, along with an associated grading plan that addresses the current code to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.

20. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a soils report to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.

21. Before grading permits are issued, the applicant must submit a grading plan to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval. Before building permits are issued, plans must show conformance with the 2013 California Building Code, 2013 California Mechanical Code, 2013 California Plumbing Code, 2013 California Electrical Code, and 2010 2013 California Energy Code, all as adopted by the ESMC. For project submitted for plan review after January 1, 2017, the 2016 editions of the uniform codes, as adopted by the City, will apply.

22. Before building permits are issued, plans must show compliance with accessibility requirements per the 2013 California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

23. The applicant must provide a complete pool enclosure that encompasses the pool per the 2013 California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

24. The applicant must provide a disabled access lift to access the pool per the 2013 California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

25. At least one stairway must access the roof per the 2013 California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.
Fire Department Conditions

26. The project must comply with all applicable requirements in the 2013 California Building and Fire Codes, and the 2013 2009 International Fire Code as adopted by the ESMC and El Segundo Fire Department regulations. For projects submitted for plan review after January 1, 2017, the 2016 editions of the uniform codes, as adopted by the City, will apply.

27. Construction of any cafeteria or kitchen facilities in the assisted living facility must include installation of a grease interceptor capable of removing fats, oils, and grease from the kitchen waste stream. If the Los Angeles County Health Department determines that the food preparation area does not require the installation of grease interceptors, then this condition will not be required.

28. Construction activities must include a storm water pollution prevention plan addressing non-storm water run-off, debris removal, track-out and protection of storm water system.

29. Any diesel-powered generators must be approved by the Fire Department, Environmental Safety Division, and provide for secondary containment, placarding, spill detection and prevention. Underground tanks require additional environmental monitoring requirements.

30. The applicant must provide the Environmental Safety Division of the El Segundo Fire Department an inventory of any and all chemicals used for laundry, pool or house cleaning, emergency generators or other devices.

31. The applicant, or designee, must contact Underground Service Alert before digging or excavating.

32. Any demolition must be screened for asbestos and lead, with proper notifications to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

Public Works Department Conditions

33. All onsite utilities including, without limitation, water, electricity, gas, sewer and storm drains, must be installed underground. Contact Southern California Edison for required service and underground requirements (Mr. John Deng at (310) 783-9305).
34. Before the City issues a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant must ensure that all curb, gutters, A.C. pavement and driveway aprons fronting 540 East Imperial Avenue and the property frontage along Walnut Avenue will be replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

35. Before the City issues a Certificate of Occupancy, all damaged or off-grade curb, sidewalk and pavement must be removed and replaced as required by the Public Works Department.

36. The applicant must secure any required encroachment permits from the Public Works Department before commencing any work in the public right-of-way.

37. The project must comply with the latest National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) for sediment control, construction material control and erosion control.

38. Before the City issues a building permit, the location and sizes of all proposed water meters must be approved by the City’s Water Division.

39. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must clean and inspect (via remote TV camera) the project sewer lateral. If found impaired, the applicant is responsible for the replacement of the lateral.

40. A registered civil engineer must provide storm (hydrologic and hydraulic) calculations for appropriate storm drain facilities to control on-site drainage and mitigate off-site impacts, as follows, subject to review and approval from the Public Works Department:

   - The design must follow the criteria contained in both the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual 2006 and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan or most recent editions. Flows must remain in their historical drainage pattern so as not to impact neighboring properties.

   - New development must not increase the rate of flow (cubic feet per second) or velocity (feet per second) of site run-off water to any off-site drainage areas beyond the measured or calculated pre-project rate and velocity.

41. Construction related parking must be provided on-site.
42. All record drawings (as-built drawings) and supporting documentation must be submitted to the Public Works Department before scheduling the project’s final inspection.

Police Department Conditions

43. Before the City issues a building permit, the applicant must submit a photometric light study to the Police Department for review and approval. A site plan must be provided showing buildings, parking areas, walkways, and the point-by-point photometric calculation of the required light levels. Foot candles must be measured on a horizontal plane and conform to a uniformity ratio of 4:1 average/minimum. The photometric study must be point-by-point and include the light loss factor (.7). Lighting levels must be adjusted to meet the minimum foot candle requirements within each area of the site. All interior or exterior corridors, passageways and pedestrian walkways and open parking lot shall be illuminated at all times with a minimum maintained one foot-candle of light on the walking surface.

44. A schematic plan of the security camera system must be submitted and approved by the El Segundo Police Department before the City issues a building permit, and must be included as a page in the stamped approved set of plans.

45. Lighting devices must be enclosed and protected by weather and vandal resistant covers.

46. Stairways must be illuminated with a minimum maintained one foot-candle of light on all landings and stair treads at all times.

47. Recessed areas of building or fences, which have a minimum depth of two feet, a minimum height of five feet, and do not exceed six feet in width and are capable of human concealment, must be illuminated with a minimum maintained 0.25 foot-candles of light at ground level during the hours of darkness. This requirement applies to defined recessed areas which are within six feet of the edge of a designated walking surface with an unobstructed pathway to it, not hindered by walls or hedge row landscaping a minimum of two feet in height.

48. All types of exterior doors must be illuminated during the hours of darkness, with a minimum maintained one foot-candle of light measured within a five-foot radius on each side of the door at ground level. The light source must be controlled by a photocell.
device or a time-clock with an astronomical clock feature and capable of operating during a power outage.

49. The addressing, open parking lot and trash dumpster must be illuminated with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the ground surface during hours of darkness.

50. Street addressing must be a minimum of 6 inches high and must be visible from the street or driving surface, of contrasting color to the background and illuminated during hours of darkness. Addressing must also be shown on plan elevations.

51. All landscaping must be low profile around perimeter fencing, windows, doors and entryways so as not to limit visibility or provide climbing access. Dense bushes cannot be clumped together in a manner that provides easy concealment.

52. Stairwell doors exiting onto the street must have a minimum 100-square inch vision panel, with a minimum five-inch width, to provide visibility into the area being entered. Vision panels must meet the requirements of the California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC. Vision panels must preclude manipulation of the interior locking device from the exterior.

53. Interior stairwell doors must have glazing panels a minimum of five inches wide and 20 inches in height and meet the requirements of the California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC. Guest rooms must have a deadbolt lock, a secondary security latch and a wide angle (190-200 degree) door viewer, not to be mounted more than 58 inches from the bottom of the door.

54. Exterior mounted ladders are prohibited except: (1) ladders with a minimum 1/8 inch-thick steel plate, securely attached to the ladders edge on each side, and extending to within two inches of the wall for a height of ten feet above ground level. A door and cover must be securely attached to the front of the ladder, and be constructed of minimum 1/8-inch steel, extending from ground level to at least ten feet high. The ladder must have non-removable hinge pins and be locked securely against the side wall by a locking mechanism with a minimum five pin tumbler operation; or (2) the bottom of the ladder must begin ten feet above the ground surface.

55. All pool entrances must be posted with "No Trespassing" signs.

56. Any pool restroom and shower doors must have access control as reviewed and approved by the El Segundo Police Department.
57. Exterior gates leading to the pool must be secured by electronic access control.

58. When a specific project option is selected, the ESPD may require the applicant to comply with more specific requirements as they pertain to: doors/hardware, windows, mailboxes, lighting, landscaping, addressing, stairwells, trash dumpsters, parking, other possible requirements they may pertain to a specific assisted living facility layout (access controls).

Construction Conditions

59. Before any construction or demolition occurs the perimeter of the property must be fenced with a minimum 6-foot high fence. The fence must be covered with a material approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department to prevent dust from leaving the site.

59a. Perimeter walls which are common to adjoining properties along Sheldon Avenue, Walnut Avenue, and McCarthy Court, are allowed a maximum height of 8 feet as measured from the highest grade.

59b. The applicant must provide at least a 48-hours’ notification to all adjacent property owners, before any vermin fumigation.

60. Public sidewalks must remain open at all times.

61. All haul trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials must either be covered or maintain two feet of freeboard.

62. NOx emissions during construction must be reduced by limiting the operation of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than 5 pieces of equipment at any one time.

63. Staging of construction vehicles and vehicle entry and egress to the site must be approved by the Public Works Department. Temporary construction driveways must be approved by the Public Works Department. Temporary construction driveways must be removed before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.

64. Construction vehicles cannot use any route except the City’s designated Truck Routes.

65. The applicant must develop and implement a construction management plan, as approved by the Public Works Department,
which includes the following measures recommended by the SCAQMD:

- Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.
- Provide temporary traffic controls during all phases of construction activities to maintain traffic flow (e.g., flag person).
- Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets.
- Maintain equipment and vehicles engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize dust emissions.
- Suspend use of all construction equipment during second stage smog alerts. Contact SCAQMD at (800) 242-4022 for daily forecasts.
- Use electricity from temporary power poles rather than temporary diesel or gasoline-powered generators.
- Diesel-powered equipment such as booster pumps or generators should be replaced by electric equipment, if feasible.
- Catalytic converters must be installed, if feasible.
- Equipment must be equipped with two-to-four-degree engine time retard or pre-combustion chamber engines.
- Use methanol or natural gas powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.
- Use propane or butane powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

66. During construction and operations, all waste must be disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. Toxic wastes must be discarded at a licensed, regulated disposal site by a licensed waste hauler.

67. All leaks, drips and spills occurring during construction must be cleaned up promptly and in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations to prevent contaminated soil on paved surfaces that can be washed away into the storm drains.

68. If materials spills occur, they must be cleaned up in a way that will not affect the storm drain system.

69. The project must comply with ESMC Chapter 5-4, which establishes storm water and urban pollution controls.
70. Before anticipated rainfall, construction dumpsters must be covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.

71. Inspections of the project site before and after storm events must be conducted to determine whether Best Management Practices have been implemented to reduce pollutant loadings identified in the Storm Water Prevention Plan.

72. The owner or contractor must conduct daily street sweeping and truck wheel cleaning to prevent dirt in the storm drain system.

73. Storm drain system must be safeguarded at all times during construction.

74. All diesel equipment must be operated with closed engine doors and must be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

75. Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

76. The applicant must provide a telephone number for local residents to call to submit complaints associated with the construction noise. The number must be posted on the project site and must be easily viewed from adjacent public areas.

77. During construction, the contractor must store and maintain equipment as far as possible from adjacent residential property locations northwest of the site.

78. As stated in ESMC Chapter 7-2, construction related noise is restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or a Federal holiday.

Impact Fee Conditions

79. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time library services mitigation fee in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Development Agreement and Resolution No. 4687. The fee amount must be based upon the adopted fee at the time the building permit is issued.

80. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time fire services mitigation fee in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Development
Agreement and Resolution No 4687. The fee amount must be based upon the adopted fee at the time the building permit is issued.

81. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time police services mitigation fee in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Development Agreement and Resolution No. 4687. The fee amount must be based upon the adopted fee at the time the building permit is issued.

82. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay a one-time park services mitigation fee in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Development Agreement and Resolution No. 4687. The fee amount must be based upon the adopted fee at the time the building permit is issued.

83. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay the required sewer connection fees (as specified in ESMC Title 12-3).

84. Pursuant to ESMC §§ 15-27A-1, et seq., and before the City issues a certificate of occupancy, the applicant must pay a one time traffic mitigation fee in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Development Agreement and Resolution No. 4443.

85. Before building permits are issued, the applicant must pay the required School Fees. This condition does not limit the applicant’s ability to appeal or protest the payment of these fees to the school districts(s).

Miscellaneous

86. The tentative map will expire pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and ESMC § 14-1-12.

87. The El Segundo Unified School District, agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City’s approval of Environmental Assessment No. 1154, Specific Plan Amendment No 16-01 for Specific Plan No. 10-03, Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision Amendment No.16-01 for Vesting Tentative Tract Map no 71582. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be
groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of Environmental Assessment No. 1154, the El Segundo Unified School District., agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section "the City" includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

By signing this document, Melissa Moore on behalf of the El Segundo Unified School District., certifies that she has read, understood, and agrees to the Project Conditions listed in this document.

Melissa Moore, Ed.D., Superintendent
El Segundo Unified School District
Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project SCH# 2011071019 Environmental Assessment No. 890
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City of El Segundo
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Contact: Ms. Trayci Nelson, Contract Senior Planner
310.524.2342

PREPARED BY:
Michael Baker International
3900 Kilroy Airport Way, Suite 120
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

On March 20, 2012, the City of El Segundo City Council certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Environmental Assessment No. 890) and granted a series of entitlements for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project – EA 890, DA 10-02, SP 10-03, SUB 10-01, ZTA 10-06, ZC 10-01, GPA 10-03, 540 East Imperial Avenue). In this certified EIR, the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project (proposed project) consisted of developing the project site with one of two conceptual project options: Option 1, Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) and Option 2, Mixed Residential Development. An application was submitted to the City to proceed with a modified version of Option 2, Mixed Residential Development, as the proposed project for 540 East Imperial Avenue. The proposed project modification involves the following discretionary approvals of the City of El Segundo:

- Specific Plan Amendment
- Development Agreement Amendment
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map Amendment

In considering these approvals, the City of El Segundo, as the Lead Agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is required to consider the environmental consequences of the revised project. This Addendum addresses the proposed modifications to the project, in accordance with CEQA.

2. **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

In accordance with CEQA, when a Lead Agency considers further discretionary approval on a previously approved project, the Lead Agency is required to consider if the previously certified/adopted CEQA document provides adequate basis for rendering a decision on the proposed discretionary action. In summary, when making such a decision, the Lead Agency must consider any changes to the project or its circumstances that have occurred and any new information that has become available since the project's CEQA document was adopted/certified.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 1516215164, prior to approving further discretionary action and depending on the situation, the Lead Agency must either: (1) prepare a Subsequent EIR; (2) prepare a Supplemental EIR; (3) prepare a Subsequent Negative Declaration; (4) prepare an Addendum to the EIR or Negative Declaration; or (5) prepare no further documentation. More specifically, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) states:

> When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revision of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous
EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a) identifies when an Addendum to a certified EIR is appropriate:

The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

3. SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The original project description analyzed in the certified EIR for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project consisted of developing one of two conceptual projects on a 5.65-acre parcel located on a former El Segundo Unified School District site at 540 East Imperial Avenue. Implementation of either project Option included demolition of the existing eight single-story structures (totaling approximately 22,488 square feet), as well as removal of all existing parking areas, the existing baseball field, and on-site vegetation.

Option 2 of the project proposed a residential development with a mix of 24 single-family dwelling units and 34 multiple-family dwelling units, with supporting circulation, parking, utility, and landscape improvements. The multiple-family units were proposed to front East Imperial Avenue on the northern portion of the project site. The single-family residences were proposed to be located on the southern portion of the project site along a new private street that would loop through the development. Both the single-family and multiple-family residential developments were proposed to have common, landscaped, open space areas. Option 2 also included a subdivision application for 31 new parcels.
The multiple-family component of Option 2 included 34 units and 11,704 square feet of common open space. Site access to this area was proposed via one 26-foot-wide, two-way driveway along Imperial Avenue, and an internal drive aisle provided access to public parking areas or multiple-family garages.

The single-family home portion of the proposed project included 24 units, 121 parking spaces, and 35,246 square feet of common open space. Site access to this area was proposed via a two-way private street at the southeast corner of the site that connected to Walnut Avenue. An internal 36-foot-wide private loop-street was also proposed to provide access to the private single-family garages.

The development standards for Option 2 included a maximum building height of 35 feet for the multiple-family dwelling units and 26 feet for the single-family dwelling units, and a maximum density of 27 dwelling units per acre for the multiple-family dwelling units and 1 dwelling unit per 5,000 square feet lot for the single-family dwelling units.

4. PROJECT REVISIONS

The proposed revised project specific plan includes modifications to the development standards and a reduction in the total number of off-street parking stalls, while maintaining the project's unit count at 24 single-family dwelling units and 34 multiple-family dwelling units. In general, the revised development standards are intended to allow for slightly larger units with greater flexibility in modulation of building facades and height restrictions.

The proposed project takes place in the same location with no changes in permitted uses, permitted accessory uses, number of units, lot coverage, lot area, lot frontage, landscaping, walls and fences, signs, or transportation demand management.

The primary revisions to Option 2 as evaluated in the certified EIR consist of the following:

- The project site would increase from 5.65 acres to 5.68 acres, due to more detailed surveying.
- The maximum height for multiple-family structures would increase by 6 inches to 35 feet 6 inches. An exception would be added for parapets and access to roof decks that would increase from 35 feet to 45 feet for the stair tower element portion only (as measured to the average height of the sloped roof). The proposed maximum height allowance of 45 feet for parapets and access to roof decks equals the approved maximum height currently allowed under Option 1 for parapets and other auxiliary structures (elevator shafts, mechanical screens, etc.).
- The minimum front yard setback for a single-family dwelling unit would decrease from 22 feet to 20 feet.
- The minimum combined front yard and rear yard setback for single-family homes would decrease from 30 feet to 25 feet.
- The net floor area ratio for single-family homes would change from 0.53:1 to 0.58:1.
- The minimum lot area for multiple-family homes would decrease from 1 unit/2,420 square feet to 1 unit/2,112 square feet, with no change in the number of units.
- The total number of parking stalls for the multiple-family component would decrease from 92 spaces to 86 spaces.
The specific plan language would be updated to reflect the City of El Segundo's 2013 Housing Element and the City's revised Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers.

The energy standards constructed to be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-certified would change to other energy standards.

The design standards would include much more detail, including modulation, material and color changes, accent features, material finishes, and architecture style.

The quantifiable revisions to the project are outlined below in Table 1, Summary of Quantifiable Project Revisions.

### Table 1
Summary of Quantifiable Project Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Feature</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Revised Project</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>5.65 acres</td>
<td>5.68 acres</td>
<td>+ 0.03 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height Limit (Multi-Family)</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>45 ft*</td>
<td>+ 10 ft*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setback (Single Family)</td>
<td>22 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>- 2 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Combined Front and Back Yard Setback (Single-Family)</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>25 ft</td>
<td>- 5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Floor Area Ratio (Single-Family)</td>
<td>0.53:1</td>
<td>0.58:1</td>
<td>0.05:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area (Multi-Family)</td>
<td>1 unit/2,420 sq ft</td>
<td>1 unit/2,112 sq ft</td>
<td>- 308 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces (Multi-Family)</td>
<td>92 spaces</td>
<td>86 spaces</td>
<td>- 6 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only applies to multi-family structures with parapets and access to roof decks; other units remain limited at 35 feet and 6 inches.

Details in regard to these changes as well as the smaller, more minor revisions to the project are discussed further in the impact comparison below as they relate to potential environmental impacts.

### 5. IMPACT COMPARISON

The revised specific plan would result in a mixed residential development of single-family and multiple-family residences with slightly shallower front setbacks for the single-family residential properties, slightly greater building heights for stairwell towers for the multi-family buildings, and a reduced number of parking spaces for the multi-family portion of the project when compared to Option 2 of the project in the certified EIR. In comparison to the original project, the revised project would result in slightly increased single-family house sizes with greater modulation of front facades and side building planes.

This section provides a discussion of the environmental factors potentially affected based on current information and the revised project description. The analysis presented herein provides a comparison of impacts between the adopted specific plan (as analyzed in the certified EIR) and the revised specific plan.
Aesthetics

Building Height

The revised specific plan would include an increase in multi-family residential building height in order to accommodate elevation changes throughout the site. However, no proposed heights would exceed the height limits evaluated in the certified EIR for Option 1. There are substantial grade changes from northwest to southeast, ranging in elevation from 146.5 feet to 107.5 feet, a change in elevation of 39 feet. Some of the buildings have been designed to have "internal" retaining walls in the building. These internal retaining walls range from a 2.8-foot retaining wall on two of the multi-family buildings to a 10-foot internal retaining wall on the Plan 1 single-family home. Refer to Exhibit 1A – Multi-Family Site Cross Section and Exhibit 1B – Single-Family Site Cross Section.

Exhibit 1A – Multi-Family Site Cross Section

Exhibit 1B – Single-Family Site Cross Section
The building heights would be measured from the finished grade to the average height of the sloped roof. A single-family home that is one-story at the front street elevation and maintains that same height to the rear of the home, even though the grade changes, would be considered a one-story home for the purposes of modulation requirements of the revised specific plan, shown in Exhibit 2 – One-Story Single-Family Height Measurement. The certified EIR stated that single-family residential dwelling units would comply with the existing height standards set forth in El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) Chapter 15-4A. Under the revised specific plan, the maximum one-story height would be 18 feet. This height limit is in compliance with the original height standards as well as the ESMC.

Exhibit 2 – One-Story Single-Family Height Measurement

Two-story single-family residential dwelling unit heights would not exceed 26 feet or two stories with the height measured from the finished grade to the average of the highest sloped roof as shown in Exhibit 3 – Two-Story Single-Family Height Measurement. This height limit is in compliance with the original height standards stated in the certified EIR and ESMC Chapter 15-4A.

Exhibit 3 - Two-Story Single-Family Height Measurement
Multi-family residential dwelling units would not exceed 35 feet 6 inches, with the exceptions of parapets and stairwell towers leading to roof decks, which would not exceed 45 feet in height measured from the finished grade to the average height of the sloped roof, as shown in Exhibit 4 – Multi-Family Height Measurement.

**Exhibit 4 – Multi-Family Height Measurement**

The revised height of 35 feet 6 inches plus the exception of a 45-foot height limit for parapets and access to roof decks exceeds the height limit of 35 feet for multiple family units set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-4. However, the revised 45-foot height limit exception is consistent with the height limit approved for Option 1, Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential, as analyzed in the certified EIR. It can be expected that the now-proposed height limit exception of 45 feet for parapets and access elements to roof decks for multiple-family housing would have substantially the same impacts as Option 1’s 45-foot height limit for parapets and other auxiliary structures (elevator shafts, mechanical screens, etc.), as evaluated in the certified EIR.

As discussed in greater detail in the certified EIR, impacts of the 45-foot height limit for parapets and auxiliary structures for Option 1 were found to have no significant impacts to scenic vistas or a scenic resource. As stated in Section I(b) of the Initial Study (Appendix A of the certified EIR):

"The proposed assisted/independent living complex would be attractively designed and would improve the view from areas immediately east of the project site as these properties have historically had a view of dilapidated, unoccupied school buildings. Any views to the north from these residential uses would not be blocked or substantially altered by the proposed assisted/independent living complex... As such, development of the assisted/independent living complex would result in no impact to a scenic vista [or scenic resource]."
The Initial Study also found that the development of the height exceptions under Option 1 would have less than a significant impact on degrading the existing visual character or quality of the site. As stated above, the construction of this option, including the height exception, was expected to beneficially change the view of the site as well as the surrounding areas. The height limitations of the revised project are expected to have substantially the same visual quality and character impacts as those identified for Option 1 in the certified EIR and such impacts would be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed adjustment is anticipated to have no impact on scenic resources or a scenic vista.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to aesthetics as a result of this project revision.

Setbacks

The certified EIR specified that the setbacks for single-family and multiple-family residential dwelling units would comply with the limits stated in ESMC Chapter 15-4A and 15-4B. The revised project provides more detail to measurements of setbacks for single- and multiple-family homes.

Details for single-family residential dwelling units are shown in Exhibit 5 – Single-Family Setback Diagram and would include the following provisions, all of which comply with ESMC:

- **Front Yard:** All front setbacks would be measured from the property line (face of the curb). The front yard setback for living areas would not be less than 20 feet. Front yard setbacks for a two-car garage would be a minimum of 24 feet measured from the garage door to the front property line. Porches or verandas in a front yard setback and not fully enclosed on three sides (railings and/or columns permitted) would potentially encroach 4 feet into the front setback.

- **Side Yard:** Structures would maintain a minimum setback on each side of not less than 5 feet. Architectural elements would potentially encroach into the side yard setback a maximum of 2 feet.

- **Rear Yard:** Structures would maintain a minimum setback of 5 feet on the first and second floors. Detached accessory structures would maintain a minimum setback of 3 feet from the rear property line on the first floor and would maintain a minimum setback of 5 feet from the rear property line on the second floor.

The adjustments in setbacks for single-family units are minor and would be made to accommodate a better comparative aesthetic appeal. Originally, as stated in ESMC Chapter 15-4A, the front yard setback would not be less than 22 feet. The minimum front yard setback in the revised project would be 20 feet for living spaces, while maintaining the 24-foot minimum front yard setback for garages. This modification would provide for modulation of front facades to create architectural interest. The proposed changes in minimum front yard setbacks would not have a significant adverse impact on the visual character or quality of the site or surrounding area.
Exhibit 5 – Single-Family Setback Diagram

Details for multiple-family residential dwelling units would include the following provisions, all of which comply with existing requirements, except where otherwise noted:

- Front Yard: The front yard setback shall not be less than 20 feet.
- Side Yard: Structures shall maintain a minimum setback on each side of the lot of not less than 5 feet.
- Rear Yard (southern property line): Structures shall maintain a minimum setback of 28 feet, which deviates from the adopted Specific Plan requirement of not less than 10 feet.

The adjustments in setbacks for multiple-family units are minor and would be made to accommodate a better comparative aesthetic appeal. Originally, as stated in ESMC Chapter 15-4C, the front yard setback would be an average of 20 feet and not less than 15 feet. The front yard setback for the revised project would be 20 feet. The proposed multi-family setbacks are equal to or more restrictive than the building envelopes evaluated in the certified EIR and, thus, would not result in any new aesthetic impacts or an increase in the severity of aesthetic impacts evaluated in the certified EIR.

The development standards discussed above would not change the overall visual appeal of the proposed project. It can be expected that these setbacks will have the same impacts as discussed in Appendix A of the certified EIR, stating:
"Due to the proposed building setbacks and design (including building heights), implementation of either Option 1 or Option 2 would not cast shadows on any of the existing surrounding/adjacent buildings. The shadow study prepared by the developer for the proposed project revealed that during the winter and summer, shadows for the proposed project would be located within the property boundaries and would not extend past those already created by development in the area. Therefore, the design of proposed Option 1 and Option 2 are compatible with the existing adjacent structures located in the surrounding area. As a result, neither Option 1 nor Option 2 would interfere with a scenic vista, and no impact would result. No mitigation is required."

In summary, the proposed development standards would not result in any new potentially significant aesthetic impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of any aesthetic impacts.

Net Floor Area and Lot Area

The revised project would include a maximum net floor area ratio of 0.58 for single-family residential buildings. This would be a 0.05 increase from the original maximum net floor area of 0.53. This change would result in a larger total gross floor area for single-family residential dwelling units.

The revised project would also include a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 2,112 square feet for the multiple-family residential buildings. This would be a 308-square-foot decrease from the original minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 2,420 square feet. This change would result in a smaller lot area for multiple-family residential dwelling units.

While these adjustments would act as a shift in density, the total number of units for single-family and multiple-family residential buildings would not change from what was previously assessed in the certified EIR. The changes in densities for both residential building types would have a nominal influence on the overall implication of the proposed project and are expected to have substantially the same aesthetic impacts evaluated in Appendix A of the certified EIR.

Therefore, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to aesthetics as a result of these project revisions.

Building Design

The revised specific plan includes more detailed design concepts and more flexibility in building modulation for the mixed residential development component in regard to accent features and material changes. The proposed project would generally be of similar scale to the existing development in the area, which includes one- and two-story single-family residences along nearby residential streets and mostly two-story multi-family buildings and a mortuary along Imperial Avenue. The architectural styles would be contemporary for the multiple-family townhomes adjacent to Imperial Avenue and a mixture of contemporary and arts and crafts styles for the single-family homes. Refer to Exhibits 6 and 7.
Exhibit 6 – Front Elevation of Multi-Family Building

Exhibit 7 – Single-Family Street Scene

While the additional design details of the proposed project are more specific than the design concepts expressed in the certified EIR, they would serve as more of a refinement of the existing design rather than a replacement or change to what was already assessed. As such, the refined architectural styles would have no new adverse aesthetic impacts. The new details demonstrate that the proposed project would be consistent with the existing visual character of the surrounding area. The updated design would not cause a substantial change in the visual appeal.
Considering the revised project would be located in the same place with the same general amount of construction, Mitigation measures MM AES-1 and MM AES-2 discussed in the certified EIR would remain applicable to the revised project. Mitigation measure MM AES-1 would reduce the impacts from daytime glare by eliminating or minimizing increased glare through the use of nonreflective glass and nonreflective textured surfaces for the proposed development. Mitigation measure MM AES-2 would ensure that exterior lighting would be designed to minimize off-site glare and remain temporary in nature. With these mitigation measures in place, impacts would remain at a less than significant level.

In summary, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regard to aesthetics as a result of the discussed project revisions.

Agriculture/Forestry Resources

As discussed in Appendix A of the certified EIR, the project site does not contain any agricultural or forestry resources and is not zoned for agriculture or forestry. Since the revised project would occur on the same site as assessed in the certified EIR, the revised project would have no impact on agricultural or forestry resources. Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to agricultural or forestry resources as a result of project revisions.

Air Quality

Section 4-1 of the certified EIR found that the project would be consistent with Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAGs) Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) growth assumptions for the City of El Segundo; therefore, the project would also be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on applicable air quality plans. This section also found that no intersection would exceed national or state standards for 1-hour or 8-hour CO concentrations, and therefore, project impacts on sensitive receptors would be considered less than significant. Construction of the project is not likely to affect a substantial number of people, due to the fact that construction activities do not usually emit offensive odors, and the certified EIR concluded the project would have a less than significant odor impact.

Section 4-1 of the certified EIR stated that a significant impact may occur if a project would add a cumulatively considerable contribution of a federal or state nonattainment pollutant. As concluded in that section:

"Construction of the proposed project would exceed SCAQMD’s recommended thresholds of significance and result in short-term air quality impacts. Accordingly, the impact of the proposed project is anticipated to be significant. Therefore, the emissions generated by construction of the proposed project would be cumulatively considerable and would constitute a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation. As described above under Impact 4.1-2, implementation of mitigation measures MM4.1-1 through MM4.1-16 would reduce these emissions, but not to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed previously under Impact 4.1-3, operation of the proposed project would not generate emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD for any of the criteria pollutants."
Because the proposed project would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for the pollutants and precursors of ozone for which the Basin is in non-attainment, the proposed project would make cumulatively considerable contributions of these pollutants during construction of the proposed project. Because no feasible mitigation, beyond what is proposed for Impact 4.1-2 (above), is available to further reduce these contributions to levels below SACQMD thresholds. This impact is considered to be cumulatively significant.

The revised project involves mixed residential development of the same number of units, equipped with the same amenities, and located at the same site as assessed in the certified EIR. Given the similar nature of the revised project, none of the project revisions would result in a change to the air quality conclusions of the certified EIR. As such, all mitigation measures in this section would remain applicable to the revised project.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to air quality as a result of project revisions.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

All construction-related and project-level long-term operational greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts would remain substantially similar to those identified in the certified EIR. The energy standards, however, have undergone some changes. The certified EIR stated that energy standards would follow LEED guidelines for building and construction purposes. The revised project no longer includes those provisions and guidelines. Rather than seeking LEED certification, the project now proposes the following:

"All homes will achieve a 15% improvement over the 2013 California Energy Code. Each home will accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. If available, near the site, and the City allows, the landscape could be irrigated by recycled water. As a standard, GreenGuard Certified insulation will be utilized."

GHG emissions would still be reduced as the proposed project would be constructed to maximize energy efficiency and sustainability. No measurable change in the volume of GHG emissions would result from the proposed project revisions. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions under the revised project would continue to be less than significant.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to GHG emissions as a result of project revisions.

**Biological Resources**

The revised project would be constructed on the same site as the original project. The project site remains completely disturbed and exists within a fully urbanized area. The proposed project is not expected to result in any impacts, direct or indirect, to special-status species, such as the El Segundo butterfly, and no mitigation measures are required. However, potential nesting habitat for common bird species protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) code does occur on and in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. Implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-1 was included in the certified EIR to prevent potential direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds in
violation of the MBTA and CDFG code, thereby reducing potential impacts to a less than significant level. This mitigation measure would still apply to the revised project.

No riparian habitats or other sensitive natural community such as wetlands, sensitive plants, animals, or habitats exist on-site. The revised project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances relating to biological resources, and no habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved plans apply to the site.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to biological resources as a result of project revisions.

**Cultural Resources**

Environmental analysis for the original proposed project concluded that impacts to historical resources would not occur, since no existing structures would be impacted by the project. Appendix A of the certified EIR determined that the project could affect archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains should such features be discovered during the construction process. Thus, mitigation measures MM CR-1 and MM CR-2 were included in the certified EIR to minimize these potential impacts to cultural resources. These mitigation measures would still apply to the revised project.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to cultural resources as a result of project revisions.

**Geology and Soils**

The revised project would be located on the same project site as the original project. Thus, on-site geologic conditions related to earthquake faulting, seismicity, liquefaction, erosion, soil instability, and expansive soils would remain the same. Since the proposed use and general arrangement/design of on-site facilities would also remain the same, the revised project would result in impacts substantially similar to those described in the certified EIR. As such, mitigation measure MM GEO-1 would still apply to the revised project to ensure that site-specific geotechnical investigations are prepared that address detailed seismic geologic, soil, and groundwater conditions at the site.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to geology and soils as a result of project revisions.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The certified EIR included an examination of potential sources of hazardous materials on the project site and in the surrounding vicinity. The analysis concluded that hazardous materials associated with the proposed project would consist mostly of construction-related equipment and materials. As such, use and/or storage of hazardous materials at the proposed project site would be minimal and not constitute a level that would be subject to regulation. Adherence to federal, state, and local regulations would also reduce the risk of project-induced upset from hazardous materials. Since the original and revised project would share the same project site and be constructed with similar techniques, the revised project would also result in a less than significant impact in regard to the potential for the project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
Consistent with the original proposed project, the revised project would involve the demolition of existing structures that could result in the exposure of construction personnel and the public to hazardous substances such as asbestos or lead-based paints (due to the on-site structures being constructed in 1956). Abatement would be conducted before demolition or construction activities at the proposed site in compliance with federal, state, and local standards and mitigation measure MM HAZ-1. To address the potential for encountering unknown contamination within the project site, mitigation measure MM HAZ-2 requires construction activities to cease if soil and/or groundwater contamination is encountered until a risk management plan is prepared that characterizes the contaminants of concern and identifies the appropriate measures to protect construction workers and the public. With these mitigation measures in place, the revised project would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous materials.

The revised project would be located on the same project site as assessed in the certified EIR. Thus, the revised proposed project would still be located 792 feet from the southern runway at Los Angeles International Airport and result in the construction of buildings that exceed 7.9 feet in height, requiring the developer to submit Form 7460-1. Mitigation measure MM HAZ-3 would ensure that the developer submits form 7460-1 (Notice of Proposed Construction or Alternation) to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

As assessed in the certified EIR, construction activities could temporarily result in lane closures on adjacent roadways. However, mitigation measure MM HAZ-4 would ensure that emergency response teams for the City of El Segundo, including the El Segundo Police Department (ESPD) and the El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD), would be notified of lane closures during construction activities in the project area and that one lane would remain open at all times to provide adequate emergency access to the site and surrounding neighborhoods.

Since the revised project would be constructed on the same site, the project would not affect any existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the site or a private airstrip in the vicinity. In addition, the project would not result in any additional impacts related to wildland fires.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to hazards and hazardous materials as a result of project revisions.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The original and revised project descriptions would affect the same project site, consist of the same type of land use and operations, affect similar project footprints, and would be constructed using similar grading/building practices. In addition, the same water quality standards would be applicable to the revised project. Thus, the revised project is anticipated to continue to result in less than significant impacts during the project construction process, upon adherence to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) standards and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Compliance with existing regulations would prevent violation of water quality standards and minimize the potential for contributing additional sources of polluted runoff. The revised project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Moreover, preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to address short-term storm water impacts during project site grading and construction would remain applicable to the revised project.
In addition, the revised project is on the same project site as the original project assessment, which is within FEMA Flood Zone Designation X (minimal flood hazard) and is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. As such, implementation of the revised project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by a seiche or tsunami or involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to hydrology and water quality as a result of project revisions.

**Land Use and Planning**

The revised project would consist of a mixed residential development on the same project site as assessed in the original project, which is designated Planned Residential Development by both the City of El Segundo's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Given the developed nature of the site vicinity, neither the original nor the revised project would result in the division of an established community, nor would they result in conflicts with an established habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The revised project would be equally consistent with the City's General Plan goals and policies as the original project. Moreover, the land use entitlements granted by the City Council in March 2012 remain relevant to the revised project. Such approvals include:

- Environmental Assessment (EA) No. 890 (certified March 20, 2012)
- General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 10-03
- Specific Plan (SP) No. 10-03
- Zone Change (ZC) No. 10-01
- Zone Text Amendment (ZTA) No. 10-06
- Development Agreement (DA) No. 10-02
- Subdivision (SUB) No. 10-01 for Vesting Tentative Map (VTM) No. 71410 and VTM No. 71582

As previously noted, the revised project requires amendments to the Specific Plan, Development Agreement, and Vesting Tentative Map. Upon approval of these amended land use entitlements, the revised project would be entirely consistent with the City's land use plans and regulations applicable to the site. As with the original project, the revised project would result in a less than significant land use impact related to consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding and mitigating an environmental effect.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to land use and planning as a result of project revisions.
Mineral Resources

Since the revised project would occur on the same site as the original project, the project would not interfere with the availability of a known mineral resource or result in the loss of a mineral recovery site. Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to mineral resources as a result of project revisions.

Noise

The revised project involves only nominal changes to building footprints and would result in demolition, site preparation, construction, and project operation activities very similar to those identified in the certified EIR. The revised project would result in the same average daily trips along the City's roadway network, resulting in the same traffic noise levels. The on-site uses would remain the same (i.e., residential use, parking, mechanical equipment, etc.), thus creating an equivalent level of on-site stationary noise. As a result, noise impacts from the revised project would be substantially similar to those identified in the certified EIR.

In addition, mitigation measure MM NOI-1 would remain applicable to the revised project to address impacts related to ambient noise levels. The revised project would also still be required to comply with Title 24, Part 2, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) and the El Segundo Municipal Code to ensure that internal noise levels do not exceed the 45-dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), resulting in a less than significant interior noise impact.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to noise as a result of project revisions.

Population and Housing

Since certification of the EIR in 2012, the City of El Segundo 2009 Housing Element has been updated. The revised specific plan would include updated policies to comply with the City of El Segundo 2013 Housing Element. The change in policies would include the following, indicated by strikeout text for deletions and underlined text for additions:

Goal 2: Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate-income households

- Policy 2.1: Establish and maintain land use controls to accommodate the housing needs of elderly, disabled and other special needs households.
- Policy 2.2: Facilitate the creation of affordable home ownership opportunities for extremely low, very low and low income households.

Goal 3: Provide opportunities for new housing construction in a variety of locations and a variety of densities in accordance with the land use designations and policies in the Land Use Element.

- Policy 3.1: Provide for the construction of 168 new housing units during the 2006-2014, 2014-2021 planning period in order to meet the goals of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) per the 2013 Housing Element.
- **Policy 3.3**: Permit vacant and underdevelopment property designated as residential develop with a diversity of types, prices and tenure.

- **Policy 3.4**: Encourage new housing to be developed within the Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use district, and on the Imperial School site.

Based on the updated Housing Element and revised RHNA numbers, the proposed project includes revising the text of the Specific Plan as follows, indicated by strikeout text for deletions and underlined text for additions:

The City of El Segundo 2009-2013 Housing Element identified a need for affordable housing to provide for a growing — senior low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers, senior citizens on fixed incomes, extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents, the disabled, military personnel, and the homeless segments of the population. As envisioned in the element, and based on that need, Option 1 would set aside fifteen (15) percent of the total units as affordable units for extremely low-, very low- and low-income senior households and Option 2 would set aside ten (10) percent of the total units will be set aside as affordable units. The set-aside is characteristic of the 55 and older senior population in the City of El Segundo which (based on the 2000 Census) represents 15.7 percent (2,510) of the total 16,033 population. Based on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), El Segundo is required to provide 468 additional housing units during the current housing cycle (2006-2014/2014-2021). The allocation of the 468 units is broken down into five categories as follows: 22 extremely low-income households, 22 very low-income households, 27 low-income households, 28 moderate-income households, and 69 above moderate-income households. The City has a total of 43 units that can be credited toward the above moderate-income requirements for the current 2006-2014 planning period.

As stated above, the City’s total number of additional housing units needed to meet RHNA allocations would decrease from 168 units to 69 units. The proposed revised project would continue to aid the City in meeting its housing production targets by providing 58 housing units, including six that would be reserved as affordable housing units. Furthermore, as the proposed number of units is within the City’s projections, the revised project would not induce substantial population growth in the City, either directly or indirectly. In addition, the revised project would not result in the displacement of housing or people.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to population and housing as a result of project revisions.

**Public Services**

As stated above, the revised project would consist of a mixed residential development of a very similar size/layout, equipped with similar amenities, and located at the same site. The certified EIR concluded that impacts related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities would be less than significant. None of the revisions to the project would result in an increase in the need for these public services or facilities in comparison to the original project.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to public services as a result of project revisions.
Recreation

Consistent with the original project, the revised project would result in an increase in the permanent residential population in the area and could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities in the City. However, as shown in the certified EIR, the proposed project would not generate a population growth that would substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities such that new or expanded facilities would be required or that would result in the physical deterioration of existing facilities. None of the revisions to the project would result in an increase in the need for or use of these facilities in comparison to the original project. Therefore, impacts to recreational facilities would be consistent with the original project assessment.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to recreational facilities as a result of project revisions.

Transportation/Traffic

The revised project would continue to meet ESMC parking requirements for the single-family component. For the multi-family component, the revised Specific Plan includes a decrease in parking spaces from 92 to 86 spaces.

For single-family uses, the ESMC normally requires two off-street parking spaces per unit and one additional space for dwelling units exceeding 3,000 square feet of gross floor area. Since the proposed single-family units are all each less than 3,000 square feet, the standard ESMC parking requirement would be 48 spaces. The single-family component of the proposed project meets the City's standard parking code requirement.

For multi-family uses, the ESMC normally requires two spaces for each unit plus two visitor spaces for the first three to five dwelling units and two visitor spaces for each additional three units. For the proposed project, this translates into 90 total parking spaces. The revised project proposes 86 total spaces for the multi-family component (2.53 spaces per unit), 4 spaces fewer than normal code requirements. The applicant is requesting a 20% reduction in guest parking spaces from 22 to 18 spaces. Despite this deviation, the revised project’s multi-family component is anticipated to provide sufficient parking to meet demand. Based on the base parking ratios identified in the Urban Land Institute's (ULI's) Shared Parking manual, residential (owned) units demand 1.7 parking spaces per unit and 0.15 visitor spaces per unit. For the proposed project, this translates into 63 total parking spaces. Based on this analysis, the proposed revised project would not result in insufficient parking capacity and impacts would remain less than significant.

Given that the number of proposed units remains the same, as do the project’s access points, the revised project’s impacts related to the local roadway system would be the same as the original assessment. Likewise, the revised project would not exceed any level of service standard established by the City or the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

---

1 (68 enclosed spaces at 2/unit) plus (22 guest spaces at 0.65/unit) for the total of 90 spaces/34 units or 2.65 spaces/unit
3 34 units x 1.7 spaces/unit = 57.8 spaces
   34 units x 0.15 guest spaces/units = 5.1 spaces
   Total = 62.9 spaces
Identical to the original project assessment, the revised project would not affect air traffic patterns at Los Angeles International Airport, located directly north of the project site. In addition, the revised project would not result in any hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access, as the proposed circulation patterns remain largely the same as those evaluated in the certified EIR.

In addition, matching the analysis in the certified EIR, the revised project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Thus, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to transportation and traffic as a result of project revisions.

Utilities and Services Systems

As stated above, the revised project would consist of a mixed residential development of a similar size/layout, equipped with the same amenities, and located at the same site as the original project description. Appendix A of the certified EIR concluded that impacts related to utilities and service systems would be less than significant. Given the similar nature of the revised project, none of the project revisions would result in an increase in the need for or the demand on utility and service systems in comparison to the original project. The revised project would have a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment requirements, wastewater treatment facilities, wastewater drainage facilities, water supplies, solid waste disposal, and energy production or transmission facilities. The revised project would also be in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. None of the project revisions would result in a change compared to those addressed in the original project. Therefore, no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur with regard to utilities and service systems as a result of project revisions.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

Based on the impact comparison provided above, the revised project would not result in new potentially significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts under CEQA. Thus, in comparison to the analysis provided in the certified EIR, the revised project would not:

1. Result in increased impacts related to degradation of the environment or impacts to biological or cultural resources.
2. Result in increased cumulative impacts.
3. Result in increased substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

6. CONCLUSION

Section 15164[a] of the CEQA Guidelines states that the Lead Agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. The project revisions described above do not result in significant modifications or have any occurrences within the conditions described in §15162. In addition, the impact comparison provided above demonstrates that no new potentially significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of impacts would occur upon implementation of the revised project.
On the basis of the evaluation contained in this document, there are no proposed changes to
the project description, changes in the circumstances under which the project is being
undertaken, or any new information of substantial importance that was not known to the Lead
Agency at the time the previous EIR was certified that trigger any of the conditions identified in
Public Resources Code § 21166 or State CEQA Guidelines § 15162 which would require a
subsequent CEQA document. Therefore, pursuant to Sections 15162 and 15164 of the State
CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum has been prepared to document the changes and additions
to the certified EIR for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project to explain the Lead
Agency’s decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR.
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INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project (State Clearinghouse #2011071019) identified mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the project in the areas of: air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and transportation. Additionally, the Initial Study for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project identified mitigation measures to reduce adverse effects of the project in the areas of: aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hazards and hazardous materials.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that agencies adopting environmental impact reports ascertain that feasible mitigation measures are implemented, subsequent to project approval. Specifically, the lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures incorporated into a project or imposed as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance during applicable project timing, such as design, construction, or operation (Public Resource Code Section 21081.6).

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) shall be used by the City El Segundo staff responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation measures associated with the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project. Monitoring shall consist of review of appropriate documentation, such as plans or reports prepared by the party responsible for implementation, or by field observation of the mitigation measure during implementation.

The following table identifies the mitigation measures by environmental resource area. The table also provides the specific mitigation monitoring requirements, including implementation documentation, monitoring activity, timing and responsible monitoring party. Verification of compliance with each measure is to be indicated by signature of the mitigation monitor, together with date of verification. The Project Applicant and the Applicant’s contractor shall be responsible for implementation of all mitigation measures, unless otherwise noted in the table.
## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

### AESTHETICS (INITIAL STUDY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM AES-1</td>
<td>Expansive areas of highly reflective materials, such as mirrored glass, must not be permitted. Nonreflective building materials must be used to the maximum extent possible to reduce potential glare impacts.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of nonreflective building materials</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of building permit</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM AES-2</td>
<td>Exterior lighting must be designed to minimize off-site glare. This may include, without limitation, using shielded or recessed lighting fixtures.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of appropriate exterior lighting Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of building permit During Operation</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1 AIR QUALITY (DEIR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-1</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that all diesel-powered equipment used will be retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalysts and diesel particulate filters). The engine catalysts must achieve a minimum reduction of 15 percent for NOx. The diesel particulate filters must meet USEPA Tier 3 standards. Contract specifications must be included in project construction documents, which must be reviewed by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB./Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-2</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at the project site use low-NOx diesel fuel to the extent that it is readily available and cost effective (up to 125 percent of the cost of California Air Resources Board diesel) in the South Coast Air Basin (this does not apply to diesel-powered trucks traveling to and from the project site). Contract specifications must be included in project construction documents, which must be reviewed by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-3</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specification that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operations at the project site utilize a phased-in emission control technology in advance of a regulatory requirement such that 30 percent of the fleet will meet USEPA Tier 4 engine standards for particulate matter control (or equivalent) starting in 2013 and for the duration of the project.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-4</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer’s specification for the duration of construction. Contract specifications must be included in project construction documents, which must be reviewed by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-5</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. Contract specifications must be included in project construction documents, which must be reviewed by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-6</td>
<td>As required by South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, all construction activities that are capable of generating fugitive dust are required to implement dust control measures during each phase of project development to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air. These measures include the following:</td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | ■ Application of soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas  
■ Quick replacement of ground cover in disturbed areas  
■ Watering of exposed surfaces three times daily  
■ Watering of all unpaved haul roads three times daily  
■ Covering all stock piles with tarp  
■ Reduction of vehicle speed on unpaved roads  
■ Post signs on-site limiting traffic to 15 miles per hour or less  
■ Sweep streets adjacent to the project site at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads  
■ Cover or have water applied to the exposed |                                                                   |                                   |                                                                   |          |      |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-7</td>
<td>Surface of all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials before leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site for each trip.</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process: Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Media Check prior to issuance of a grading permit. Monitoring Milestone: Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. Party Responsible for Monitoring: City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-8</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, be turned off when not in use for more than 30 minutes. Diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater than 10,000 pounds must be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be approved by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process: Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Media Check prior to issuance of a grading permit. Monitoring Milestone: Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. Party Responsible for Monitoring: City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM4.1-9</strong></td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM4.1-10</strong></td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM4.1-11</strong></td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-12</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that trackout roads will meet SCAQMD Table XI-C standards to achieve a 46% reduction in PM$_{10}$. The construction contractor must install gravel bed trackout apron (3 inches deep, 25 feet long, 12 feet wide per lane and edged by rock berm or row of stakes) to reduce mud/dirt trackout from unpaved truck exit routes. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be approved by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-13</td>
<td>When the City issues building or grading permits, whichever is issued earlier, the developer must notify, by mail, owners and occupants of all developed land uses within 1,000 feet of a project site within the Specific Plan providing a schedule for major construction activities that will occur through the duration of the construction period. In addition, the notification will include the identification and contact number for a community liaison and designated construction manager that would be available on site to monitor construction activities. The construction manager is responsible for complying with all project requirements related to PM$_{10}$ generation. The construction manager will be located at the on-site construction office during construction hours for the duration of all construction activities. Contract information for the community liaison and construction manager will be located at the construction office, City Hall, the police department, and a sign on site.</td>
<td>Proof of Notification mailers</td>
<td>After the issuance of a grading or a building permit, whichever is issued earlier prior to start of construction activities.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-site Notice Posting</td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of El Segundo 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project EIR MMRP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-14</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that the architectural coating (paint and primer) products used would have a VOC rating that reduces VOC content by 15 percent or more. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be approved by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-15</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that materials that do not require painting be used during construction to the extent feasible. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be approved by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.1-16</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that pre-painted construction materials be used to the extent feasible. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be approved by the City of El Segundo before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-1</td>
<td>Construction of either Option of the proposed project must avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting season to the extent feasible. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds must be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than 14 days before construction. The area surveyed must include all clearing/construction areas, as well as areas within 250 feet of the boundaries of these areas, or as otherwise determined by the biologist. If no active avian nests are identified or within 250 feet of the limits of the proposed disturbance area, no further mitigation is necessary. If active nests are found within 250 feet of the proposed disturbance area, clearing/construction activities must be postponed within 250 feet of the nest until a wildlife biologist has identified the nesting avian species. If the avian species is not protected under the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, no further action is required and construction activities may proceed. If the avian species is protected under the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, no action other than avoidance of the active nest(s) may be taken without consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). In addition, a minimum 100-foot buffer zone surrounding the active nest(s) must be established until the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts, as determined by the wildlife biologist. The size of the buffer area may be reduced if the wildlife biologist determines, upon consultation and concurrence from the CDFG, that the size of the buffer area would not be likely to have adverse effects on the particular species.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading plans and building plans for inclusion. If necessary, bird nesting survey and consultation with CDFG.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit and building permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department and California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM CR-1</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading plans. Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion. If necessary, assessment of resource by qualified archeologist. If necessary, preparation of a research design for recovery of cultural resources in consultation with the state Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of Public Resources Code § 21083.2. The archeologist or paleontologist must complete a report of the excavations and findings, and must submit the report for peer review by three County-certified archeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the County must submit this report to the Los Angeles Archeological Information Center and keep the report on file at the County of Los Angeles. After the find has been properly mitigated, work in the area may resume.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit. During Grading Prior to recommencement of grading.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department Office of Historic Preservation and Los Angeles Archeological Information Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit/Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM CR-2</td>
<td>If human remains are discovered during any demolition/construction activities, all ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the remains must be halted immediately, and the Los Angeles County coroner must be notified immediately, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code § 7050.5. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC must be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project developer must also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant, including the excavation and removal of the human remains.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading plans. Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If necessary, NAHC notification, field investigation, and consultation with Most Likely Descendant.</td>
<td>During Grading.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department and Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of El Segundo 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Project EIR MMRP
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOLOGY/SOILS (INITIAL STUDY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM GEO-1</td>
<td>Approved Geotechnical Report. Review and approve grading plan and building plans for inclusion of recommendations.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (DEIR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-1</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on building plans. Review and approve contract specifications and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the City issues a building permit, the developer must demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures meets or exceeds the most recent Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards, subject to review by the Planning and Building Safety Department. Documentation of compliance with this measure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval before the City issues the permit. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the Planning and Building Safety Department before it issues a certificate of occupancy. The following design features should be considered by the developer as a way to achieve Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards compliance in excess of the minimum requirement.
## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limit air leakage through the structure or within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate dual-pane or other energy efficient windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate energy efficient space heating and cooling equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate energy efficient light fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate energy efficient appliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate energy efficient domestic hot water systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate solar panels into the electrical system as feasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate cool roofs/light-colored roofing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or incorporate other measures that will increase the energy efficiency of building envelope in a manner that when combined with the other options listed above exceeds current Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards by a minimum of 20 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-2</td>
<td>Before the City issues a building permit, the developer must provide a landscape plan that includes shade trees around main buildings, particularly along southern elevations where practical, and will not interfere with constraints. Documentation of compliance with this measure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.</td>
<td>Project landscaping and building plans. Review and approve landscaping and building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-3</td>
<td>All showerheads, lavatory faucets, and sink faucets within the residential units, and where feasible within non-residential developments, must comply with the California Energy Conservation flow rate standards.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL/Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-4</td>
<td>Low-flush toilets must be installed within all Congregate Care units as specified in Health and Safety Code § 17921.3.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-5</td>
<td>The developer must ensure that landscaping of common areas for the proposed project uses drought-tolerant and smog-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover to ensure long-term viability and to conserve water and energy.</td>
<td>Project landscaping and building plans. Review and approve landscaping and building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-6</td>
<td>The developer must ensure that the landscape plan for the proposed project includes drought-resistant trees, shrubs, and groundcover within the parking lot and perimeter.</td>
<td>Project landscaping and building plans. Review and approve landscaping and building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-7</td>
<td>The developer must ensure that designs for the proposed project include all illumination elements to have controls to allow selective use as an energy conservation measure.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-8</td>
<td>Before the City issues any certificate of occupancy, the developer must demonstrate that the proposed projects' interior building lighting supports the use of compact fluorescent light bulbs or equivalently efficient lighting to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-9</td>
<td>The developer must consider providing preferential parking spaces for ultra-low-emission vehicles and alternative fueled vehicles to encourage the use of alternative fuels and ultra-low-emission vehicles. Documentation of compliance with this measure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-10</td>
<td>Before the City issues a building permit, the developer must demonstrate that the proposed project is designed to incorporate exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public/common areas. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department before the City issues a certificate of occupancy.</td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department; Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-11</td>
<td>All common-area irrigation areas for the proposed project must consider systems that are capable of being operated by a computerized irrigation system that includes an on-site weather station/ET gage capable of reading current weather data and making automatic adjustments to independent run times for each irrigation valve based on changes in temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, rain, and wind. In addition, the computerized irrigation system must also consider the ability to be equipped with flow-sensing capabilities, thus automatically shutting down the irrigation system in the event of a mainline break or broken head. These features will assist in conserving water, eliminating the potential of slope failure due to mainline breaks, and eliminating over-watering and flooding due to pipe and/or head breaks. Documentation of compliance with this measure must be provided to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.</td>
<td>Project landscaping and building plans. Review and approve landscaping and building plans for inclusion of features</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of building permit</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.2-12</td>
<td>The developer must, where feasible, incorporate passive solar design features into the buildings, which may include roof overhangs or canopies that block summer shade, but that allow winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows.</td>
<td>Project building plans. Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of building permit</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (INITIAL STUDY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM HAZ-1 Before demolition and/or construction activities, the proposed project site must be tested for asbestos and lead by a licensed contractor. The contractor must follow all applicable local, state, and federal codes and regulations related to the treatment, handling, and disposal of asbestos and lead if the proposed project requires asbestos and/or lead abatement.</td>
<td>Testing for asbestos and lead and potential abatement.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of demolition permit and grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM HAZ-2 In the event that previously unknown or unidentified soil and/or groundwater contamination that could present a threat to human health or the environment is encountered during construction at the project site, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the contamination must cease immediately. If contamination is encountered, a Risk Management Plan must be prepared and implemented that (1) identifies the contaminants of concern and the potential risk each contaminant would pose to human health and the environment during construction and post-development and (2) describes measures to be taken to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards. Such measures could include a range of options, including, without limitation, physical site controls during construction, remediation, long-term monitoring, post-development maintenance or access limitations, or some combination thereof. Depending on the nature of contamination, if any, regulatory agencies must be notified (e.g., El Segundo Fire Department). If needed, a Site Health and Safety Plan that meets Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements must be prepared and in place before commencement of work in any contaminated area.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications grading plans, and building plans for inclusion. If necessary, Risk Management Plan and Site Health and Safety Plan.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit and building permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM HAZ-3</td>
<td>Before project implementation, the developer must submit Form 7460-1 (Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration) to the Federal Aviation Administration for project review and approval.</td>
<td>Submission of Form 7460-1 and project review and approval.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-1</td>
<td>The developer's contractor must refrain from engaging in all construction-related activities, including the delivery of construction materials, the loading and unloading of construction equipment, starting the engine ignition, and the repair and servicing of construction equipment and vehicles between the hours of 6:00 PM and 7:00 AM Monday through Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. Construction noise levels must not exceed the noise and vibration standard set in El Segundo Municipal Code §§ 7-2-4(C) and 7-2-10(O). If construction activities result in the generation of noise that exceeds the noise and vibration standards set forth by the El Segundo Municipal Code, a noise permit must be obtained from the City of El Segundo before commencing any construction activities.</td>
<td>Visual Inspection</td>
<td>During grading and construction</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-2</td>
<td>The developer's construction contracts must require implementation of the following construction best management practices (BMPs) by all construction contractors and subcontractors working in or around the project site to reduce construction noise levels: Not less than 10 days before the start of construction, the developer must mail a written notification to owners and occupants of all developed properties within 1,000 feet of the project site. The notification must provide a schedule of major construction activities that will occur throughout the duration of the grading plan and building plan processing.</td>
<td>Grading Plan and Building Plan Processing</td>
<td>Before issuance of grading permits</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB/ Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction period. In addition, the notification must include the identity and contact number of a designated community liaison and designated construction manager who will be available on site to monitor construction activities during regular working hours. The construction manager will be located at the on-site construction office during construction hours for the duration of all construction activities. Contact information for the community liaison and construction manager will be posted on the exterior of the construction office or trailer at the construction site, at City Hall, and at the City's Police Department. The notification must also include the permitted hours of operation and all relevant information regarding limitations on noise-generating activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer and its contractors and subcontractors must ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards or as required by the Planning and Building Safety Department, whichever is the more stringent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer and its contractors and subcontractors must place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer and its contractors and subcontractors must implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL./Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-3</td>
<td>The developer's contracts with its construction contractors and subcontractors must include the requirement that construction staging areas, construction worker parking and the operation of earthmoving equipment within the project site, are located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible. Contract provisions incorporating the above requirements must be included as part of the project's construction documents, which must be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Building Safety Department.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-4</td>
<td>The developer must require by contract specifications that heavily loaded trucks used during construction must be routed away from residential streets to the extent possible. Contract specifications must be included in the proposed project construction documents, which must be reviewed by the City before grading permits are issued.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion. Visual Inspection</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During Grading and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-5 Residential units must be designed and constructed to ensure that interior noise levels from exterior transportation sources—including aircraft and vehicles on adjacent roadways—cannot exceed 45 dBA CNEL. In order to ensure that all dwelling units achieve an adequate noise reduction to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL, the following features must be included in the building design and construction of all dwelling units: (1) upgraded dual-glazed windows, (2) mechanical ventilation/air conditioning, (3) exterior wall/roof assemblies free of cut-outs or openings, and (4) ceiling insulation in the top floor of each building to reduce aircraft noise by at least 20 dBA. Before a building permit is issued, the developer must submit architectural plans and a detailed acoustical analysis study prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant demonstrating that interior noise levels in all residential units would be 45 dBA CNEL or less to the Planning and Building Safety Department for review and approval.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4.3-6 The ESUSD must make as a condition of sale of the proposed project site, that the future owner express acknowledgement and confirmation of the continuing applicability of the existing aviation easement for noise, vibrations, and fumes over the proposed project site property.</td>
<td>Proof of acknowledgement and confirmation to buyer</td>
<td>Prior to commencement of the project</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit./Cond. No.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</td>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Process</td>
<td>Monitoring Milestone</td>
<td>Party Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM4.3-7       | In accordance with the Business and Professions Code and Civil Code each prospective purchaser of residential property within the Project and all subsequent purchasers must be notified as follows:  
   - NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY—This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (e.g., noise, vibration, soot, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. The property is within the 65 db CNEL noise contour. The property is required to achieve an interior noise of not more than 45 db CNEL. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.  
   In addition, although not required by Civil Code Sections 1103, et seq., each prospective tenant of leased residential property within the Project must also be notified as described above. | Proof of acknowledgement and confirmation to buyer | Prior to commencement of the project | City of El Segundo—Planning and Building Safety Department |          |      |         |
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit./Cond. No.</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Monitoring and Reporting Process</th>
<th>Monitoring Milestone</th>
<th>Party Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5 TRANSPORTATION (DEIR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM HAZ-4</td>
<td>To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction activities would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, the project developer must consult with the City of El Segundo Police, Fire, and Public Works Departments to disclose temporary lane or roadway closures and alternative travel routes. The project developer will be required to keep a minimum of one lane in each direction free from encumbrances at all times on perimeter streets accessing the project site. In the event any full road closure is required, the project developer's contractor must coordinate with the City of El Segundo Police, Fire, and Public Works Departments to designate proper detour routes and signage to appropriate proper access routes.</td>
<td>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans. Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion.</td>
<td>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td>City of El Segundo—Police, Fire, Public Works and Planning and Building Safety Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154, Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01 for SP No. 10-03, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02 to:

- Amend the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) (SP No. 10-03) to clarify design details to implement the Mixed Residential Development Option 2, such as adjustments to lot coverage, floor area ratio, height for the multi-family stair tower element, a reduce guest parking standard for the multi-family units, a decrease in the combined front yard and rear yard setback for single family homes, street widths narrowed on the single family portion of the project, modified modulation requirements, and relief from the LEED Certification requirements;
- Amend Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582 to adjust the parcels and street widths to accommodate the proposed housing development;
- Amend Development Agreement No. 10-02.

The Project site is located at 540 East Imperial Avenue, in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) Zone (the “Site”).
(Applicant: D.R. Horton Homes CA2, Inc.)
(Property Owner: El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD))

RECOMMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: It is recommended that the Planning Commission, open the public hearing and take public testimony on the project; close the public hearing and consider the evidence; and, adopt Resolution No. 2805 recommending that the City Council:

a) adopt the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
b) approve Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154, Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02; and

- authorize the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Exhibit A - Draft Planning Commission Resolution No. 2805
   A. Conditions of Approval
   B. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Adopted January 2012)
2. Exhibit B - Addendum to the EIR for EA 890, 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (August 2016) & Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program (MMRP) (January 2012)
3. Exhibit C - Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Letters
4. Exhibit D - Draft Development Agreement
5. Exhibit E - Draft Ordinance
6. Exhibit F - Approved Specific Plan (January 2012)
7. Exhibit G - Draft Amended Specific Plan
8. Exhibit H - Plans with Amended VTM 71582 (in pocket)

ORIGINATED BY: Trayci Nelson, Contract Principal Planner/Project Manager
REVIEWED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
APPROVED BY: Sam Lee, Director of Planning and Building Safety

I. INTRODUCTION

The proposed project is a request for a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 16-01) to amend the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP) Mixed Residential Development Option 2 to allow increased lot coverage for the single-family dwelling units; an increase in the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) for the single family dwelling units; an increase in height for the multi-family stair tower element (only) for the multi-family units; a reduced guest parking standard for the multi-family units; a decrease in the combined front and rear yard setback for the single family homes; a decrease in the street width on the single family residential side; modified modulation requirements; and relief from the LEED Certification requirements. While the overall site configuration remains generally the same, an amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582 to create fewer lots, and to adjust the parcels and street widths to accommodate the D.R. Horton project layout is also proposed. Lastly, the associated Development Agreement Amendment grants the City public benefits in exchange for development rights detailed herein and requires the developer enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before the first certificate of occupancy is issued for the project.

II. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Background

On January 26, 2012 the El Segundo Planning Commission approved Environmental Assessment No. EA-890, General Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 10-01, Specific Plan 10-03, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06, Development Agreement No. 10-02, and Subdivision No. 10-01 for Vesting Tentative Map Nos. 71410 and 71582 to allow for the construction of one of two possible conceptual options on a 5.65-acre surplus school site.

Option 1 consisted of a three-story, 150 unit assisted living complex and a 150-unit senior apartment/condominium complex and four market rate apartments/condominiums. Option 1 allowed for an FAR of 0.75:1 and a height limit of 35 feet for buildings, and 45 feet for parapets.
Option 2 consisted of 34 multi-family dwelling units taking access from Imperial Avenue, and 24 single-family dwelling units taking access from Walnut Avenue, for a total of 58 units. Option 2 allowed for an FAR of 0.53:1, and a height limit of 35 feet for multi-family dwelling units, and 26 feet for single-family units. On March 20, 2012 the City Council approved the project and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The City Council also adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD) has entered into an agreement with D.R. Horton Homes for the latter’s right to purchase and develop the school site property. D.R. Horton Homes seeks to develop the property as expressed in the Option 2 conceptual layout of the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (540 EIASP). Since the approvals under both options of the 540 EIASP were conceptual, in order to design and build the homes to the specific single-family and multi-family product mix unique to the D.R. Horton style, amendments (noted above) to the original approvals are necessary.

**Project Site and Vicinity**

The project site is bordered by East Imperial Avenue to the north, multiple-family residential uses to the east, multiple-family residential uses and East Walnut Avenue to the south, and single-family residential uses and a mortuary to the west. The project site is 0.15 mile south of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The project site is also located approximately 0.8 mile west of Sepulveda Boulevard.

Site topography is varied with an overall slope from northeast to southwest of roughly five percent. The site is currently developed with eight single-story brick structures (totaling
22,488 square-feet) that at one time served as administrative offices and classrooms for the former Imperial Avenue Elementary School that occupied the site. The existing structures on site extend along the eastern property line, from the northern to the southern portion of the site. A 0.5-acre baseball field, currently utilized for little league baseball on weekends, is also located on the site.

The adjacent area is surrounded primarily with single-family and multi-family residential uses. Additionally, there is a mortuary immediately adjacent to the site at the northeast corner of Sheldon Avenue and East Imperial Avenue. The surrounding uses are as described in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Imperial Highway, community dog park, and LAX (north of the northern City boundary).</td>
<td>Open Space (O-S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-Family and Multi-Family residential uses</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and R-3 (Multi-Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single-Family and Multi-Family residential uses</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and R-3 (Multi-Family Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-Family residential uses and a Mortuary</td>
<td>R-1 (Single Family Residential) and C-2 Neighborhood Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

The applicant is proposing to develop the subject property, in accordance with the same general layout for the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, adopted in 2012. The D.R. Horton proposal for Option 2, maintains the same number of single-family and multi-family dwelling units with 24 and 34 units respectively. However, the proposal increases the allowable FAR for the single-family dwelling units, resulting in slightly larger homes. Further, the proposal decreases the building area per dwelling unit for the multi-family units while maintaining the same number of units. There are no proposed changes for Option 1 which will remain part of the amended Specific Plan.
The proposal maintains the same general layout and circulation pattern of the original Option 2 approval. Access to the site will remain unchanged. The multi-family units, located on the northern front portion of the project site, will take access via the same 26-foot-wide two-way driveway along Imperial Avenue. An internal drive aisle would provide access to guest parking spaces and private parking garages. The 24 single-family units, located on the southern portion of the project site, will also take direct access from the same two-way private loop-street at the southeast corner of the site, connecting to Walnut Avenue. An internal private loop-street would provide vehicular access to the garages of the single-family units. The proposed amendment includes reducing the width of the private loop-street that serves the single-family units from 36-feet wide, down to 26 feet wide at the entrance along Walnut Avenue, then widening to a 32-foot-wide right-of-way as it curves west into the interior of the tract. No vehicular access would be provided between the multiple-family residential and the single-family residential uses as approved in the existing Specific Plan.

Parking for the project remains the same for the single-family units (2 car garage per unit), however the total guest parking for the multi-family units is reduced by four spaces. Lot coverage and density remain the same as defined in the 540 East Imperial Specific Plan however, the specific lot coverage calculation for each lot is clarified.

Maximum building height for the single-family units remain unchanged however, the definition of a single-family unit changed slightly, for modulation purposes only. Building heights for the multi-family units increased slightly for the main livable unit, and increased more substantially, to match the heights approved in the assisted living Option 1 component. The increase only applies to a stair tower element on the multi-family units and not for the entire building.

The setback calculation changes slightly for the single-family and multi-family units, but in both instances the changes maintain or increase the setback and provide for a more simplified approach to applying the required setback.

The building modulation requirements have been completely updated and revised to provide greater clarity and ease of application, while providing greater flexibility in design and construction to the homeowner, architect, builder, and staff in the approach and application of the requirement.

The LEED Certification sustainability requirement has been changed to allow for a 15 percent improvement over the 2014 Certified Energy Code. Each unit will also be designed to accommodate the future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and compliance with ESMC 13-1-14 noise insulation standards.

When the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan was approved, it was the property owner’s intent (El Segundo Unified School District (EUSD)) at the time to entitle the property and develop the site at a later time. As such, designs for the product mix were conceptual and provided enough detail that a basic plan could be approved. However, in order to build the homes unique to the D.R. Horton style, amendments to the original
Specific Plan approvals are necessary. A comparison of the original Specific Plan standard and the proposed amendment to the standard is provided in Table 2. Where no change to the text of the approved 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan occurs, the standard remains the same and no discussion is provided.

Table 2
540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Option 2 Approved vs Proposed Ammendments Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Plan Item</th>
<th>Approved SP Option 2</th>
<th>Proposed SP Amendment for Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Construct 34 Multi-family dwelling units and 24 single-family units</td>
<td>34 Multi-family units 24 Single-family units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>(Page 18) 0.53:1 for single-family</td>
<td>(Page 27) 0.58:1 max for single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For multi-family lots greater than 15,000 sqft, 1 dwelling unit/2,420 sqft of lot area</td>
<td>(Change:+0.05:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page 27) 1 dwelling unit/2,112 square feet for multi-family with a maximum of 34 units.</td>
<td>1 dwelling unit/2,112 square feet for multi-family with a maximum of 34 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-308sqft but no increase in units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage/Density</td>
<td>(Page 17) “The Mixed Unit Development cannot exceed a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family units and thirty-four (34) multi-family units. The exact mix and layout of housing is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with this Specific Plan.”</td>
<td>(Page 21) 24 single family units 34 multi-family units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page 21) 24 single family units 34 multi-family units</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>(Page 17) “Single-family residential dwelling units must comply with ESMC 15-4A” Max height 26 feet.</td>
<td>(Page 21-24) Single-family 26 feet (No Change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Multi-family dwelling units cannot exceed 35 feet in height”</td>
<td>Change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-family: 35 feet 6 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parapet may extend 42 inches above roof deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roof structures to house stairway access (only) to roof decks...Sloped roof average height of 45 feet/max 47 feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Access and Parking | Single-family: In accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4A:  
Front/Rear: The combined total of setbacks for the front and rear yards must be at least 30 feet, with no front yard setback less than 22 feet and no rear setback less than 5 feet. Porches and verandas not fully enclosed on 3 sides may encroach into the front setback a maximum of 6 feet.  
Side: 10% of the width of the lot but not less than 3 feet and need not be more than 6 feet.  
Multi-Family: In accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4B:  
Front: An average of 20 feet but not less than 15 feet.  
Side: 10% of the width of the lot but never less than 3 feet and need not be more than 5 feet.  
Rear: 10 feet minimum | Multi-family: 86 (68 @ 2/unit (enclosed in garages), plus 18 guest spaces @.53/unit (2.53 spaces per unit)  
(Change = -.13/unit) |
| --- | --- |
| Setbacks | (Page 24-25) Single-family  
Front/Rear: 20 feet for living areas, 24 feet for garages. Porches and verandas not fully enclosed on 3 sides may encroach 4 feet into the front setback.  
(Change: -2 feet less in the front. Combined total front and rear setback is 5 feet less however, 5 foot minimum rear setback is still maintained)  
Side: Minimum of 5 feet  
Side for Lot 1 (only): 5 feet on the west side and 12 feet minimum on the east side. |
| Street Widths | 36 foot width/Private  
(Change: -4 feet width) | 32 feet interior to single-family units  
(Change: -4 feet width) |
| Modulation Requirements | Single Family: Modulation of the 2nd floor exterior perimeter walls must occur on the second floor of the dwelling that is equal to a minimum of 15% of the building area (including garages and carports) on the ground floor, but not less than 200 sf of area. Modulation must occur on the side of the structure that faces the yards. The total area required to be modulated must be divided equally between both sides of the building facing the side yards. Modulation must be a minimum of 4 feet in depth and must be a maximum of 6 feet in depth. Multi-family: No plane of a building wall facing a property line shall exceed 24 feet in height or length without at least a 2 foot offset for a minimum length or 6 feet in the wall plane. | 26 feet at Walnut Entrance to single family units (Change -10 foot width) Private streets (No Change) (Page 28-30) Single Family: Change: The entire section has been revised to allow greater flexibility in design and construction: - On two story homes, the front floor must be setback at least 1 foot from the first floor. - The 2nd floor shall be no more than 60% of the first floor footprint. - Modulation of the second floor exterior perimeter walls must occur where the wall is visible from the street. - Second floor side walls visible from the street must have a varied setback. - All second story side walls not visible from the street must include 3-dimentional accents. - Second floor rear walls must have an off-set a minimum of 15 feet. Multi-family: No change | LEED Certified | (Page 28) Change: All homes will achieve a 15% improvement over 2013 Certified Energy Code. Each home will accommodate the future installation of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure. Compliance with City noise insulation standards (ESMC 13-1-4) shall be met. As a standard, GreenGuard Certified insulation will be utilized throughout the project. |
III. ANALYSIS

Affordability Component

The Amended 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan will maintain the affordability requirements set forth in the existing Specific Plan by providing a total of 6 affordable units to qualified households, which represents 10% of the total 58 units. The units will be provided in the multi-family section of the project and will be spread over the entire project by providing one unit in each multi-family building. The units would be similar in exterior appearance, interior appointments, and configuration and basic amenities (such as storage space and outdoor living areas) to the market rate units in the proposed project. Further, covenants and agreements would be recorded against the affordable units, which would be specifically designated as affordable for a term of 55 years, concurrently with the recordation of the final map or the issuance of the certificate of occupancy of the building.

The draft Amendment to the Development Agreement would require the developer to enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before a certificate of occupancy being issued for the project. The Affordable Housing Agreement would outline the developer’s obligations with respect to the affordable units and would be recorded on the property.

Additionally, in an effort to provide a greater opportunity for El Segundo residents to have priority for the affordable units, a condition of approval is proposed that will require the developer to provide a marketing implementation plan that will focus on notification of residents of the availability of the affordable housing and information regarding the requirements and benefits.

Specific Plan Amendment

The proposed 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan Amendment modifies design guidelines to achieve a more defined project with specific development standards and design guidelines to fit the D.R. Horton product mix. This amendment does not change the underlying zone or general plan land use designation which will remain 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. The Amended Specific Plan will guide the buildout of the project site in a manner that is consistent with City and State policies and standards, and ensures that the project is developed in a coordinated manner. The proposed project, which amends the text of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, would be consistent with the General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives as generally set forth in the draft Resolution.
General Plan Consistency

If the Specific Plan Amendment is approved, the land use designation for the project site will remain 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and will remain consistent with the General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives and the Specific Plan as set forth in detail in the draft Resolution.

Zoning Consistency

If the Zone Change is approved, the zoning designation for the project will be 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan. The Specific Plan would augment the development standards of El Segundo’s zoning regulations. When an issue, condition or situation occurs which is not covered or provided for in the Specific Plan, the zoning regulations that are most applicable to the issue, condition or situation will apply. The proposed conceptual project (Option 1 or Option 2) meets the development standards set forth in the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan § 4.2 Development Standards.

Amendment to Development Agreement

As noted above, the Planning Commission approved the underlying Development Agreement No. 10-02 in 2012. The applicant proposes to contribute $800,000 to the City as a public benefit contribution for the greater latitude afforded to the developer through the amendment to the Specific Plan, and to reimburse the City’s anticipated costs of setting up, maintaining and recertifying the affordable housing program for the 6 required affordable units.

The developer proposes an Amendment to the Development Agreement that references the amendment to the Specific Plan. The draft Amendment would also require the developer to enter into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City before the certificate of occupancy is issued for the project.

The Development Agreement, as amended, would provide the following public benefits in exchange for valuable development rights (10-year entitlement with an option for a 5-year extension):

1. Development of a property that is currently vacant and underutilized.
2. Increase housing, in particular much needed affordable for area residents.
3. Development of a project that is consistent with the General Plan.
4. Development of a property that includes affordable housing for the community with a ten percent set aside required for Option 2.

Because the Amendment to the Development Agreement is still being negotiated by the parties, there may be modifications to the Amendment after the Commission’s consideration of this project and before or during the City Council hearing of this project. The Planning Commission may recommend the City Council approve the Amendment as currently proposed or with modifications.
Vesting Tentative Map

If this project is approved allowing the Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map (No. 71582), the amended map would subdivide the property into 25 lots, plus one lettered lot that contains the interior loop-street, resulting in a reduction of 6 lots compared to the original 2012 approval. Lot No. 25, which is the multi-family portion of the property, will be subdivided for condominium purposes. ESMC § 14-1-6 requires the Planning Commission to deny a request for a subdivision map if it makes any of the findings consistent with Government Code § 66474: Based upon the administrative record, it does not appear that any facts would support findings for denial for the proposed project (see findings in attached draft Resolution No. 2805- Exhibit A). The vesting tentative map would expire twenty-four months after approval or conditional approval but may be extended for a period not to exceed five years, pursuant to Government Code § 66452.6 and ESMC § 14-1-12. The development rights expire when the vesting tentative map expires unless a final map is approved before the expiration date.

Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Review

In accordance with the Public Utilities Code (PUC) §21676, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) (the LA County Planning Commission) is responsible for reviewing local jurisdiction’s actions to determine compatibility with the adopted Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The type of project requiring ALUC review includes adoption and amendment of specific plans affecting property within an established ALUP planning boundary. Since the proposed project is a specific plan on property located within the airport influence area established for the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), the project must be reviewed by the ALUC for consistency with the ALUP. Recommendations made by the ALUC are advisory only to local jurisdictions. The final decision to agree or disagree with an ALUC consistency determination is at the discretion of the local jurisdiction’s final decision making body, which is the El Segundo City Council. On February 22, 2012, the ALUC reviewed the 540 East Specific Plan Project and found it to be consistent with the ALUP subject to the following conditions:

- Avigation easements must be established for each new parcel created by the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and no vesting tract map of building permit will be issued until the avigation easements are in place. The avigation easements must run with the deed and title of the land and be transferred to every successive property owner.

- The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, must be informed of and have approval over the nature and scope of the avigation easements for the new parcels created by the Specific Plan.

- The notice of airport in the vicinity that is referenced in EIR mitigation Measure 4.3-7 shall also specify in plain and explicit language the property is located in the airport influence area of Los Angeles International Airport and by residing in this location, residents will be subject to exterior noise levels of 65dB and above as well as vibrations and fumes due to the sites proximity of the airport.
The proposed amendments to the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan were forwarded to ALUC for its review. The ALUC found the modifications to be consistent with the ALUP and did not require further ALUC review (see ALUC Determination letter Exhibit C). The conditions noted above will remain in effect.

IV. INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

The project application and plans were circulated for comment. Staff has incorporated those comments as conditions of approval in the Resolution.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project was analyzed for its environmental impacts and an Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Environmental Assessment No. 890 (540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan) was prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. Under CEQA, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR is appropriate if minor changes or additions to the EIR are necessary to reflect the proposed modifications to the project in the environmental analysis and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred (CEQA Guidelines §15164). Generally, the conditions described in Section 15162 have not occurred if the proposed modifications do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines §15164[c]); however, an addendum must be considered by the decision-making body before making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines §15164[d]).

This Addendum to the previously-certified EIR demonstrates that the environmental analysis, impacts, and mitigation measures identified in the 2012 EIR for Environmental Assessment No. EA-890 remain substantively unchanged despite the proposed project revisions. It supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the significance level of impacts identified in the previous Environmental Impact Report. The mitigation measures listed in the certified EIR for EA 890, are sufficient to reduce the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

It is important to note that in 2012, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC) for the following EA 890 impact areas:

**Air Quality - Construction.** Temporary construction activities for either Option 1 or Option 2 would violate air quality standards for VOC's even with full implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM4.1-1 through MM4.1-16).

**Noise - Operation.** While neither project (Option 1 or Option 2) would result in a substantial ongoing increase in exterior noise levels during operation, both project
Options would increase the permanent, noise sensitive residential population on the project site even with full implementation of MM4.3-6 and MM4.3-7 because of the site's proximity to LAX.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations is required when a project will cause an unavoidable significant impact that cannot be mitigated. To the extent the impacts would remain significant after mitigation, the impacts were acceptable and outweighed by social, economic and other benefits of the projects. The Addendum found these impacts would not be made worse by the project modifications. Therefore, the Statement of Overriding Consideration (SOC), as adopted by the City Council in 2012 (Resolution 4772 and Ordinance 1469), will remain.

VI. PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMENTS

D.R. Horton conducted two, two-hour community outreach meetings; one on July 27, 2016 and one on August 17, 2016. The meetings were held at the El Segundo Unified School District Office Board Room located at 641 Sheldon Street. Both workshops were well attended with more than 30 people in attendance, including local residents, members of the EUSD School Board, City staff, and other government officials. Visitors were able to see the project plans, watch a 3D video of the project, and ask questions of the D.R. Horton team. Overall comments were positive.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, staff recommend that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2805 recommending that the City Council a) consider the Addendum to the previously adopted Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, b) approve Environmental Assessment No. EA-1154, Specific Plan Amendment No. SPA 16-01, Subdivision No. Sub 16-01 for Amended Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582, and Development Agreement Amendment No. 16-01 for Development Agreement No. 10-02; and c) authorize the City Manager to execute an Affordable Housing Agreement with the developer, in a form approved by the City Attorney’s office.
May 17, 2016

City of El Segundo Planning Division
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Trayci Nelson,

SUBJECT: 540 EAST IMPERIAL AVE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT
540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE, EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245
Referral No. RPPL2016002267

In accordance with your request, staff of Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission has reviewed the proposed modifications in the Specific Plan Amendment (Project) at 540 East Imperial Avenue in the City of El Segundo and provides comments below:

The Project is located within the LAX Airport Influence Area, therefore in accordance with the Public Utilities Code (PUC), Section 21676, the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has the responsibility of reviewing local jurisdiction actions for compatibility with the adopted Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The following ALUC Review Procedures are potentially applicable to the proposed project:

- The 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan was previously reviewed by ALUC on February 22, 2012, which determined that the Specific Plan was consistent with the ALUP. Pursuant to Policy 1.5.1.(a), any amendment to a previously reviewed Specific Plan affecting property within an airport influence area requires a referral to the ALUC for a determination of consistency with the ALUP prior to final approval by the City of El Segundo.

- Pursuant to Policy 1.5.2.(a), any proposed land use actions, including specific plan amendments, shall initially be reviewed by ALUC Administrative Officer. If the Administrative Officer determines that significant compatibility issues are evident with the specific plan amendment, the proposal shall be forwarded to the Commission for review and decision. ALUC authorizes the Administrative Officer to approve the proposed action having no apparent compatibility issues of significance.

Prior to the local jurisdiction taking final action, the specific plan amendment requires ALUC review of a Major Aviation Case. Filing and processing information for aviation cases can be found at: http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/apps/aviation_how-to-file.pdf.
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If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Alyson Stewart at (213) 974-6432 or via email at astewart@planning.lacounty.gov, between 7:30 am and 5:30 PM, Monday through Thursday. Our office is closed on Fridays.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
Richard J. Bruckner
Director

Bruce Durbin, Supervising Regional Planner
Ordinance Studies/ALUC Section

BD:as
February 29, 2012

Kimberly Christensen, AICP, Planning Manager
City of El Segundo
Planning and Building Safety Department
350 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245-3813

Dear Ms. Christensen,

SUBJECT: AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION ACTION OF FEBRUARY 22, 2012
AVIATION CASE NO. 201100002-(4)
540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT

At their February 22, 2012 public hearing, the County of Los Angeles Airport Land Use Commission reviewed the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan for consistency with the policies of the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). After considering testimony and discussion, the commission voted to find the project consistent with the ALUP subject to the attached conditions.

If you have any questions, please contact David McDonald at (213) 974-6425, or email at dmcdonald@planning.lacounty.gov, Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Our offices are closed on Fridays.

Sincerely,

Carmen Sainz
Supervising Regional Planner

CS:dm

Attachment: Findings, Conditions and Order of the Airport Land Use Commission, County of Los Angeles

c: California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics
   El Segundo Unified School District (Geoff Yantz)
   Mar Ventures (Bill Misori)
FINDINGS, CONDITIONS AND ORDER OF THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

AVIATION CASE NO. 201100002-(4)
COMMISSION HEARING DATE: February 22, 2012

SYNOPSIS:
The proposed project consists of a general plan amendment, a specific plan, zone change, zone text amendment, two vesting tentative tract maps, and a development agreement which allow for the redevelopment of a 5.65-acre former school site located at 540 East Imperial Highway in the City of El Segundo. The project known as 540 East Imperial Specific Plan would result in the demolition of the former Imperial Avenue Elementary School and the development of one of two conceptual options. Option 1 would include a maximum of 150 assisted/independent living units along Imperial Avenue, 150 senior apartments/townhomes in the center of the site and a separate four-unit townhome development at the southern end of the project site. This option would create seven legal lots on the site.

Option 2 would include a residential development with a mix of 24 single-family dwelling units and 34 multiple-family units on private streets. The multiple-family units would front East Imperial Avenue on the northern portion of the project site. The single-family residences would be located on the southern portion of the project site. This option would create 31 lots. Both the single-family and multiple-family residential developments would have common areas and landscaped open space area.

Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review of this project is necessary because the project site is located within the planning boundary established for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The project site is entirely within the 65dB CNEL noise contour portion of the planning boundary. ALUC review is also necessary because a specific plan, general plan amendment, zone change, and other discretionary actions are needed for project approval. The project therefore must be reviewed for consistency with the policies of the adopted Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP).

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

February 22, 2012 Public Hearing
Staff made a presentation on the key elements of the project and the relevant Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) consistency issues. Kimberly Christensen, City of El Segundo Planning Manager, then made a presentation on the project to the Commission. No public testifiers attended the hearing. After discussion regarding the avigation easement, the noise implications of Option 1 versus Option 2 and the limited scope of the ALUC to noise and safety issues, the ALUC determined that the project is consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan and directed staff to add on additional finding and two conditions of approval. The finding is to enter into the record a preference for Option 1 due to it being more likely to achieve sound reduction in a more
controlled environment with windows likely to be closed and fewer children present. The conditions requested are regarding the avigation easements and include inserting requirements that before any new parcels are created on the site, new avigation easements for each parcel be established, that there is a process established to notify and give the ALUC approval of the language in the avigation easements, and that the notification language include references to the possibility that over time noise contours can change and airport noise can increase. The Commission then closed the public hearing and instructed staff to finalize the documents for a finding of consistency.

FINDINGS:

1. The State Aeronautics Act Section 21670, et seq. of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC) requires every county in which there is an airport served by a scheduled airline to establish an airport land use commission.

2. Pursuant to Section 21670.2 of the PUC, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission has the responsibility for acting as the Airport Land Use Commission for Los Angeles County.

3. In 1991 the Los Angeles County ALUC adopted the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) that sets forth policies, maps with planning boundaries, and criteria for promoting compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them.

4. The ALUP contains policies and criteria to minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards.

5. Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is one of fourteen public use airports in the County whose land use compatibility policies and programs are contained within the adopted ALUP.

6. Pursuant to Section 21674(d), 21676(b), 21672(c), 21661.5, 21664.5(a), and 21664.5(b) of the PUC, the County ALUC has the responsibility to review specific plans, general plan amendments, zoning ordinances, and related development proposals within the established airport influence area for consistency with the adopted ALUP, before final action is taken by the local agency.

7. The site for the proposed project, known as 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan, is located within the Airport Influence Area established for LAX. The project site is located within the 65dB CNEL noise contour portion of the Airport Influence Area.

8. The project site is located within the City of El Segundo on East Imperial Avenue and is approximately 792 feet south of the airport property boundary of LAX. The project site is bounded by the rear of the parcels on the east side of Sheldon Avenue to the west, Walnut Street and the rear of the parcels on the
north side of Walnut Street to the south, the rear of the parcels on the west side of McCarthy Court to the east, and Imperial Avenue to the north.

9. The proposed project would result in the demolition of eight (8) existing school buildings, a surface parking lot, a playfield including a baseball diamond and the development of one of two conceptual options. Option 1 consists of a 150 unit assisted/independent living facility, a 150 unit senior apartment development and four townhomes for a total of 304 units and a maximum of 175,000 square feet of developed space. Option 2 consists of 34 townhome units and 24 single-family homes for a total of 58 residential units.

10. To approve this project, the City of El Segundo must certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and approve Specific Plan No. 10-03, General Plan Amendment No. 10-03, Zone Change No. 10-01, Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71410 for Option 1 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71582 for Option 2, and Development Agreement No. 10-02.

11. Specific Plan No. 10-03 will add the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan designation to the zoning code which will establish permitted uses and development standards for the project site.

12. General Plan Amendment No. 10-03 will change the Land Use Category from Planned Residential Development (maximum of 65 residential units on the project site) to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan (maximum of 304 residential units on the project site).

13. Zone Change No. 10-01 will change the zoning designation of the project site from Planned Residential Development to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.

14. Zone Text Amendment No. 10-06 will delete the Planned Residential Development Zone from the El Segundo Municipal Code (ESMC) and add 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to the ESMC and delete ESMC Chapter 15-4D (Planned Residential Development) in its entirety.

15. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 71410 for Option 1 will create seven lots. Lot 1 will accommodate a four unit townhome building. Lot 2 will accommodate a 150 unit senior apartment development consisting of nine (9) buildings, pool and open space areas, the parking area for the apartments, a fountain and guest parking for the assisted/independent living portion of the site. Lots 3 through 7 accommodate the 150 unit assisted/independent living development consisting of ten (10) buildings, a small area of parking and pool area.

16. Vesting Tract Map No. 71582 for Option 2 will create 31 lots. Lots 1 through 24 will range from 5,032 to 7,225 square feet and accommodate 24 single family homes. A private street will have an entrance on Walnut Avenue and serve all 24 homes. Lots 25 through 31 will accommodate 34 townhomes consisting of 6 buildings and driveways and parking areas with a driveway entrance on Imperial
17. Development Agreement No. 10-02 is an agreement between the El Segundo Unified School District, the owner of the project site, and the City of El Segundo. The provisions therein outline all of the definitions, liabilities and all conditions of development that apply to the project site. Approval of the Development Agreement is necessary to define the legal parameters, party responsibilities, required infrastructure improvements and development standards for the project site to be developed with one of the approved options.

18. Pursuant to the Airport Noise Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Chapter 6, Section 5000 et seq.), the County of Los Angeles declared LAX to be a noise problem airport. The Airport Noise Standards require noise problem airports to reduce the size of its Noise Impact Area (NIA), which is the area within the airport's 65 dB CNEL contour that is composed of incompatible land uses.

19. The project site is located within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour as depicted in the 2009 LAX 4th Noise Standards Quarterly Report.

20. New residential units within LAX's 65 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour will increase the NIA unless an avigation easement for aircraft noise has been acquired by the airport proprietor.

21. The El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD) granted the City of Los Angeles as owner and operator of the Los Angeles International Airport an aviation easement for noise, vibrations and fumes over the proposed project site. Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 in the Draft EIR requires that the ESUSD make as a condition of sale of the project site, that the future owner express acknowledgement and confirmation of the continuing applicability of the existing aviation easement for noise, vibrations, and fumes over the project site property.

22. Section 5.1 of the Development Agreement requires that the future developer of the project site comply with the Development Agreement and the Project Approvals including, without limitation, all mitigation measures and all Future Approvals for the project site.

23. The land use proposed for the site (a combination of single-family and multi-family residential uses) by both Option 1 and Option 2 are consistent with ALUP Policy G-1, which requires new uses to adhere to the Land Use Compatibility Table. The Land Use Compatibility Table provides that new residential uses in the 65 dB CNEL use caution and review sound insulation needs. Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 in the Draft EIR requires that all residential units on the project site be designed and constructed to ensure that interior noise levels not exceed 45 dB CNEL.

24. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy G-2, which requires recycling of
incompatible land uses to uses which are compatible with the ALUP, pursuant to
the Land Use Compatibility Table. The Land Use Compatibility Table lists new
residential uses in the 65 dB CNEL as compatible provided sound insulation
needs are reviewed, and lists educational facilities as not compatible. The
project proposes replacing the vacant school buildings with residential structures
that are designed and constructed to achieve and interior noise level of 45 dB or
less.

25. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy G-3, which requires that avigation
easements be considered as a condition of approval on any project within the
designated planning boundaries. The El Segundo Unified School District as land
owner of the project site granted the City of Los Angeles as owner and operator
of Los Angeles International Airport an aviation easement for noise, vibrations
and fumes over the project site.

26. Policy G-4 of the ALUP prohibits projects that would affect safe air navigation
into the airport. The project does not include devices or structures that would
negatively affect safe air navigation and is therefore consistent with ALUP Policy
G-4.

27. The project is consistent with Policy N-1, which requires that the CNEL method
for measuring noise impacts near airports be used in determining suitability for
various types of land uses. The project used the CNEL method to determine that
the proposed uses are compatible.

28. The project is consistent with Policy N-2, which requires that sound insulation
insure a maximum interior 45 dB in new residential, educational, and health-
related uses in areas subject to exterior noise levels of 65 dB CNEL or greater.
Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 in the Draft EIR requires that all residential units on the
project site be designed and constructed to ensure that interior noise levels do
not exceed 45 dB CNEL.

29. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy N-3 which requires that new
development within the ALUC's planning boundary adhere to the Table Listing
Land Use Compatibility for Airport Noise Environments. The Table provides that
new residential uses in the 65 dB CNEL use caution and review sound insulation
needs. Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 in the Draft EIR requires that all residential
units on the project site be designed and constructed to ensure that interior noise
levels not exceed 45 dB CNEL.

30. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy N-4, which encourages local agencies
to adopt procedures to ensure that prospective property owners in aircraft noise
exposure areas above a current or anticipated 60 dB CNEL are informed of these
noise levels and of any land use restrictions associated with high noise exposure.
Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 in the Draft EIR requires that each prospective buyer
and renter of residential property within the project be notified of the
development's vicinity to LAX and the potential impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.3-
7 further states that the aviation easement granted to the City of Los Angeles as operators of LAX by the property owner, the El Segundo Unified School District, be kept in force by subsequent owners who must inform all buyers and tenants of the project site's location within an airport noise area.

31. The project site is located outside the runway protection zones (RPZ) established for LAX and is consequently not subject to ALUP Safety Polices S-1 through S-4, which relate to the RPZ.

32. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy S-5, which prohibits uses which would attract large concentrations of birds, emit smoke, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation. The project does not propose uses which would attract large concentrations of birds.

33. The project is consistent with Policy S-6, which prohibits uses which would generate interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation. The project does not propose uses which would generate electrical interference.

34. The project is consistent with ALUP Policy S-7 which requires that projects comply with the height restriction standards of the FAA through FAR Part 77. The Specific Plan establishes a maximum height of 45 feet for the project site, including mechanical equipment, which is less than the 200-foot threshold established by the FAA; however, the project site is located approximately 792 feet from the southern runway at LAX and would therefore be required to submit Form 7460-1 if implementation of the proposed project results in the construction of buildings that exceed 7.9 feet in height. The proposed project would result in the construction of buildings approximately 35 and 45 feet in height respectively for Option 1 and Option 2, thereby exceeding the 7.9-foot height threshold. Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 would ensure that the developer submits Form 7460-1 (Notice of Proposed Construction or Alternation) to the FAA.

35. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the project by the City of El Segundo. The Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission has considered the environmental effects of the project as shown in the Draft EIR.

36. After hearing the testimony in this case, for the record, the ALUC prefers to have development Option 1 implemented due to the fact that the sound insulation measures incorporated into the project design to mitigate airport noise to 45dB will be more effective incorporated in the multi-family structures whose residents are more apt to keep windows and doors shut than in a development with single family homes whose residents are more likely to open windows and have children who will use the private yards of the single family homes in Option 2.

CONDITIONS:

1. Avigation easements must be established for each new parcel created by the
540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan and no vesting tract map or building permit will be issued until the avigation easements are in place. The avigation easements must run with the deed and title of the land and be transferred to every successive property owner.

2. The Los Angeles County Regional Planning Department acting as the Airport Land Use Commission be informed of and have approval over the nature and scope of the avigation easements for the new parcels created by the Specific Plan.

3. The notice of airport in vicinity that is referenced in EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-7 shall also specify in plain and explicit language the property is located in the airport influence area of Los Angeles International Airport and by residing in this location, residents will be subject to exterior noise levels of 65dB and above as well as vibrations and fumes due to the sites proximity to the airport.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION DETERMINES: In view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, that the project presented in Aviation Case No. 201100002-(4) is CONSISTENT with the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan.

VOTE: 4-0

Dissenting:
Abstaining:
Absent: 1
Action Date: 02/22/12
Prepared for:
The El Segundo Unified School District
By
The City of El Segundo
Planning Department
January 2012
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PROJECT SITE AND ADJACENT USES
SENIOR HOUSING COMMUNITY/MULTI-FAMILY (R-3) OPTION 1
MIXED RESIDENTIAL UNIT DEVELOPMENT OPTION 2
1.0 SUMMARY

This Specific Plan was prepared to provide guidance and to allow flexibility when developing a 5.65 acre parcel located on a former El Segundo School District Site at 540 East Imperial Avenue (the "Project Site") consistent with the adjoining uses.

Under this Specific Plan, the Project Site can be developed with one of the following conceptual project options a Senior Housing Community with a Multi-Family Residential (R-3) component, or a Mixed Residential Development, as further defined in Section 1.7 "PROJECT DESCRIPTION."

Detailed text and exhibits which more fully describe the conceptual options and improvements envisioned for construction are included in this Specific Plan. The Specific Plan will guide the build-out of the Project Site in a manner that is consistent with City and State policies and standards and ensures that the Project is developed in a coordinated manner.

1.1 PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY OF SPECIFIC PLAN

The purpose of this Specific Plan is to provide a foundation for the proposed land uses on the subject property through the application of regulations, standards and design guidelines. The 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan provides text and exhibits which describe the proposed land uses and associated guidelines.

This Specific Plan has been adopted in accordance with the provisions of Government Code §§ 65450 through 65457 which grant local governments authority to prepare Specific Plans of development for any area regulated by a General Plan. These sections also identify the required contents of a Specific Plan and mandate consistency with the General Plan.

According to Government Code § 65450, a Specific Plan must include text and a diagram or diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:

- The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space within the area covered by the plan.

- The proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the land area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan.

- Standards and criteria by which development will proceed, and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.

- A program of implementation measures including regulations, programs, public works projects and financing measures necessary to carry out the above items.

- A discussion of the relationship of the Specific Plan to the General Plan.
A thorough review of the El Segundo General Plan shows that this Specific Plan is compatible and consistent with the goals and policies outlined in the General Plan. This Specific Plan will further the goals and policies of the General Plan as more fully described below.

This Specific Plan was prepared to provide the essential relationship between the policies of the El Segundo General Plan and actual development in the project area. By functioning as a regulatory document, the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan provides a means of implementing and detailing the City of El Segundo’s General Plan. All future development plans and entitlements within the Specific Plan boundaries must be consistent with the standards set forth in this document.
1.2 PROJECT GOALS

The goal of this Specific Plan is to develop housing within the City of El Segundo which will help the City achieve its Regional Housing Needs Allocation, including the opportunity to develop much needed senior housing and affordable housing.

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION AND ADJACENT LAND USES

Regionally, the Project Site is located in the northwest quadrant of the City of El Segundo, adjacent to the City's northern border along Imperial Avenue. The Project Site is almost one mile east of Sepulveda Boulevard (Highway 1) and the entrance to the Century Freeway (Interstate 105), approximately 2.4 miles east of the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405), and immediately south of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).

Locally, the Project Site is located on the south side of East Imperial Avenue between Sheldon Avenue and McCarthy Court. Immediately to the west of the Project Site on Imperial Avenue is a mortuary in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-2) Zone; single-family residences abut the remainder of the western boundary of the Project Site. Immediately to the east of the Project Site are R3 lots with multi-family residences; a sump lies about half-way down along the eastern side of the property and single-family residences lie at the southeastern property line. The Project Site borders R-3 with multi-family residences on the southern property line (Exhibit 1).

Exhibit 1 Project Site and Adjacent Land Uses
1.4 PROJECT SITE HISTORY

The 5.65-acre 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan site (project site) comprises six lots and is currently developed with the Imperial Avenue Elementary School. The elementary school was built in 1956. Because of declining enrollment in the El Segundo Unified School District (ESUSD), the school campus was closed in 1975 and in 1979 was declared Surplus Property by ESUSD. In 1984, it was used as an employee training facility for the Hughes Aircraft Company. In 1997, the school campus was re-opened under a lease to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) as a special needs school, but was closed again a few years later. In 2007 the ESUSD Board of Education established a 7-11 Surplus Property Committee to determine what should be done with the site. The Committee work developed in three phases: information gathering; public input; and discussion. Based on the Committee's work, in 2009 the District began the process to entitle the site for development, including the option of a senior housing community.

In September 2010 the District applied for various land use entitlements that would allow the site to be developed with a Senior Housing Community. In November 2010 the District revised its applications to provide for the option of building either a Senior Housing Community or a Mixed Residential development.

Before approving this Specific Plan and other related applications, the General Plan designation and the zoning of the site was Planned Residential Development (PRD) which allowed a maximum of 29 single-family units and 36 multi-family units to be built on the entire 5.65 acre site. The change of both the General Plan and zoning to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan allows for either option (discussed above) to be developed.

1.5 EXISTING SITE

The proposed Project Site is currently developed with eight (8) single-story structures (totaling 22,488 square feet) that served as administrative offices and classrooms. Existing structures at the Project Site extend from the northern to the southern portion of the site, along the eastern property line. Development on the Project Site also includes open space and recreational facilities in the form of playground equipment and an approximately 0.50-acre baseball field on the west-northwest portion of the property. While the school has remained unoccupied, the baseball field is currently utilized for little league baseball on weekends between January and June. Several scattered trees line the western portion of the project site with ground cover near the baseball field. Generally, the project site slopes from a high point at the northwest corner of the site, along East Imperial Avenue, to a low point at the southeast corner of the site along Walnut Avenue. The site is graded into two pads with a 2:1 slope separating them. The overall slope of the site from northwest to southeast is roughly 5 percent. Impervious surfaces on the site consist of asphalt parking areas and building roofs. Pervious surfaces on the proposed project site consist of open space and a ball field.

The Specific Plan area will encompass the entire 5.65 acre site.

1.6 CEQA COMPLIANCE

In compliance with CEQA an EIR was prepared for this Project. The EIR analyzed two separate options: a Senior Housing Community consisting of 150 assisted living units and 150 senior
apartments/townhomes with four townhomes built on the southern portion of the property; and a mixed residential development consisting of 24 single-family homes and 34 multi-family homes.

In accordance with Government Code § 65457, any residential development that is developed consistent with this Specific Plan is exempt from further CEQA analysis unless an event specified in Public Resources Code § 21166 occurs as to the Specific Plan.

1.7 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 540 East Imperial Avenue site will be developed in substantial conformance with one of the Options described below.

Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Specific Plan Option 1)

The Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Specific Plan Option 1) would consist of the following types of development, with the assisted living and senior residential both restricted to individuals fifty-five (55) years or older:

- On 5.32 acres: an assisted living development consisting of dwelling units made up of: assisted and/or independent living units which will provide common facilities such as a common kitchen and dining room, game playing area, library, exercise room, pool and restrooms, as well as individual kitchenettes which at a minimum will include a refrigerator, sink and microwave; and a senior residential development consisting of apartments and/or condominiums. The development would include a maximum of 150 assisted/independent living units and 150 senior apartments/townhomes.

- The southern .33 acres of the Project Site which fronts on Walnut Avenue would be developed under Multi-Family Residential (R-3) standards. Four (4) townhomes would be built on the remaining 0.33-acre parcel, located at the southern end of the project site. While the four townhomes are part of the 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan development, they would be re-zoned and developed separately from the larger assisted/independent living complex and senior apartments/townhomes, pursuant to the Multi-Family Residential (R-3) development standards.

Mixed Residential Development Option (Specific Plan Option 2)

Under the Mixed Residential Development Option (Specific Plan Option 2) the property could be developed with a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family and thirty-four (34) multi-family units on private streets. The multiple-family units would front East Imperial Avenue on the northern portion of the project site. The single-family residences would be located on the southern portion of the project site.

1.8 ENTITLEMENTS

The following entitlements were granted in conjunction with this Specific Plan.

- General Plan Amendment changing the land use designation from Planned Residential Development (PRD) to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan.
- Zone Text Amendment to: 1) delete the Planned Residential (PRD) Zone from El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") § 15-3-1; 2) add 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to ESMC § 15-3-1; 3) add a new ESMC § 15-3-2(A)(7) "540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan"; and 4) delete ESMC Chapter 15-4D (Planned Residential Development (PRD) in its entirety.

- Zone Change to rezone Property from Planned Residential Development (PRD) to 540 East Avenue Imperial Specific Plan.

- Development Agreement between the City of El Segundo and the El Segundo Unified School District.

- Vesting Tentative Map No. 71410 - dividing the Specific Plan Area into seven (7) new parcels or Vesting Tentative Map No. 71582 dividing the Specific Plan Area into thirty one (31) new parcels.
2.0 **CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN**

Government Code § 65454 requires that the Specific Plan be consistent with the General Plan. Government Code § 65451 requires a statement of relationship between the Specific Plan and the General Plan. As documented by the EIR, the Specific Plan is consistent with the General Plan. The two elements that are most related to the Project are the Land Use Element and the Housing Element; the consistency with these two elements is discussed below.

### 2.1 LAND USE ELEMENT

The City amended the General Plan designation and zoning of the Project Site to 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan to allow the development options set forth in this Specific Plan of either a Senior Housing Community with a multi-family component or a Mixed Residential development.

The Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Option 1) may consist of an Assisted Living development and/or a Senior Residential development. Although the Senior Housing Community would allow the opportunity for more development than the previous zoning, senior housing does not generate significant noise, traffic or other impacts that would be detrimental to neighboring residential uses. Due to the size and slope of the property, the Senior Housing Community would be designed in such a way so as to minimize the visual impacts on the surrounding residential uses.

The Specific Plan also provides that the Mixed Development Option (Option 2) will be limited to not more than twenty-four (24) single-family units and not more than thirty-four (34) multi-family units. This is very similar to what was previously allowed and therefore this use remains consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element.

Like the previous Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning on the property, the Specific Plan will allow design flexibility and will continue to provide transitional uses that are consistent with the surrounding residential uses which will help protect one of the City's greatest attributes, its residential area.

More specifically, the Specific Plan promotes the following from the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan:

- **Goal LU3: Proper Distribution of Residential Land Uses** – Promote the health, safety and well being of the people of El Segundo by adopting standards for the proper balance, relationship, and distribution of the residential land uses.

- **Objective LU3-2** – Preserve and maintain the City's low-medium density residential nature, with low building height profile and character, and minimum development standards.

- **Policy LU3-2.1** - Promote construction of high quality Multi-Family Residential developments with ample open space, leisure and recreational facilities.
- **Policy LU3-2.2** - Multi-family developments will be located only in appropriate places and evaluated carefully to ensure that these developments are not detrimental to the existing single-family character.

- **Policy LU3-2.3** - Appropriate buffers such as walls, landscaping, or open space, shall be provided between residential and non-residential uses.

- **Policy LU3-2.4** - Low density areas shall be preserved and zone changes to higher density shall be carefully investigated for compatibility to existing uses.

### 2.2 HOUSING ELEMENT

The City of El Segundo currently has a larger proportion of seniors than the County of Los Angeles as a whole (12.3% vs. 9.7%). In 2009, the City adopted the most current version of its Housing Element which recognizes this trend in population growth of the senior community and the need for expanded housing programs for seniors, including assisted living facilities. The Housing Element also recognizes the Project Site as an underutilized site, development of which will help satisfy the City’s housing needs. The Specific Plan will allow the opportunity for even more housing of a much needed type to be built than the 65 units previously allowed under the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning. More specifically the Specific Plan implements the following goals of the Housing Element (as adopted in 2009):

- **Goal 2:** Provide sufficient new, affordable housing opportunities in the City to meet the needs of groups with special requirements, including the needs of lower and moderate-income households.

  - **Policy 2.1** - Establish and maintain land use controls to accommodate the housing needs of elderly, disabled and other special needs households.

- **Goal 3:** Provide opportunities for new housing construction in a variety of locations and a variety of densities in accordance with the land use designations and policies in the Land Use Element.

  - **Policy 3.1** – Provide for the construction of 168 new housing units during the 2006-2014 planning period in order to meet the goals of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).

  - **Policy 3.3** – Permit vacant and underdeveloped property designated as residential to develop with a diversity of types, prices and tenure.

  - **Policy 3.4** – Encourage new housing to be developed within the Smoky Hollow Mixed-Use district, and on the Imperial School site.

---

1 The reference noted here is taken from the City of El Segundo Housing Element (2009) which defines seniors as age 65 and older. This project will provide senior housing for persons age 55 and older which increases the percentage and the total number of seniors in El Segundo as noted in § 4.2 (Affordability) of this Specific Plan.
3.0 PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

3.1 CIRCULATION

Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Option (Option 1)

In order to reduce traffic impacts along Walnut Avenue, a .33 acre lot on the southerly side of the Project Site will be created for multi-family housing which will be physically separated from the rest of the Project Site. Access to the remaining 5.32 acres, which will house the Senior Housing Community, will be via two driveways on East Imperial Avenue which will provide circulation and emergency access throughout that portion of the Project Site.

Mixed Residential Development Option (Option 2)

The Mixed Residential Development will provide for the multi-family units to front and take access from East Imperial Avenue and the single-family units to take access from Walnut Avenue which will minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding streets. The circulation system for the single-family homes will be developed so as to be adequate for emergency vehicles.

3.2 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

A. Water Service

Water service is provided by the City of El Segundo and is currently available within the Specific Plan Area. The site is currently served by connections to an existing 6" diameter main in Walnut Avenue and 10" main in Imperial Avenue. The Project would maintain these connections, add connections as necessary and provide for on-site domestic and fire water services.

B. Sewer Service

Sewer service within the project area, which is west of Sepulveda Boulevard, is provided by underground sewers maintained by the City of El Segundo. The site is currently served by an 8" sewer running along the easterly property line, which drains to an existing 8" main in Walnut Avenue. The Project would continue to drain to Walnut Avenue.

C. Solid Waste Disposal

Solid waste disposal is provided to commercial users by a variety of private haulers and to residential users by Consolidated Waste Disposal. The Assisted Living development within the Specific Plan area would contract with a provider. Landfill capacity is adequate for the assumed population and commercial growth within Los Angeles County. The 540 East Imperial Avenue Specific Plan would not exceed any assumptions for either population or commercial growth in the region.

D. Gas Service

Gas service is provided by Southern California Gas Company. A 2" service line is available in Walnut Avenue.
E. Electric/Telephone and Cable Service

Electric service is provided by Southern California Edison. Telephone service is provided by AT&T, Verizon and Sprint via existing lines in adjacent streets and cable service is provided by Time Warner Cable, Direct TV and Dish Network.

F. Fire Suppression

The El Segundo Fire Department (ESFD) provides fire protection services and emergency medical service to the City. The Specific Plan area is approximately 1 mile from Station 1 located at 314 Main Street in Downtown El Segundo and approximately 1.8 miles from Fire Station 2 located at 2261 Mariposa Avenue. Water for fire suppression is available from existing water lines via hydrants adjacent to the Project Site. Private hydrants will be installed if required to provide coverage for approved structures.

G. Police Services

The El Segundo Police Department provides police protection services to the City. The Specific Plan area is approximately 1 mile from the police station located at 348 Main Street.

H. Drainage

On-site drainage must comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.
4.0 LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

4.1 DISTRIBUTION AND LOCATION OF LAND USE

SENIOR HOUSING COMMUNITY/MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) OPTION (OPTION 1)

Under this option, the southern .33 acre “tail” of the property which fronts on Walnut Avenue will be developed in accordance with the provisions of the R-3 (multi-family) zone and will be physically separated from the remainder of the Project Site.

There are two types of housing that will be developed under the Senior Housing Community: Assisted Living and Senior Residential which may be placed on the remaining 5.32 acres in substantial conformance with the approved concept site plan provided that the overall development does not exceed the total square footage and FAR set forth below and meets all of the other Development Standards set forth in Section 4.2.

The following graphical depiction provides a concept for the Senior Housing Community with Senior Housing that provides for 150 assisted and/or independent living units on the northern portion of the Project Site and 150 Senior Dwellings on the southern portion of the Project Site. The .33 acre R-3 (multi-family) “tail” piece is also shown (Exhibit 2). This concept may be modified in accordance with the procedures for minor and major modifications set forth in Section 4.3 below.
MIXED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPTION (OPTION 2)

Under this development option, multi-family lots would be created fronting East Imperial Avenue. The remainder of the property to the south would be developed with single-family lots that would be accessed from Walnut Avenue.

The following provides a concept of the Mixed Residential Unit Development. This concept may be modified in accordance with the procedures for minor and major modifications set forth in Section 4.3 below.

Exhibit 3 - Mixed Residential Unit Development Option 2

JANUARY 2012  540 EAST IMPERIAL AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN
4.2 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Except as otherwise provided, this Specific Plan must be administered pursuant to the ESMC. The development standards set forth herein for both development options are intended to provide flexibility in the development while providing consistency with adjacent uses.

Where this Specific Plan does not specifically regulate, development must comply with the ESMC.

AFFORDABILITY

The City of El Segundo 2009 Housing Element identified a need for affordable housing to provide for a growing senior population. As envisioned in the element, based on that need Option 1 would set aside fifteen (15) percent of the total units as affordable units for extremely low, very low and low income senior households and Option 2 would set aside ten (10) percent of the total units as affordable units. The set aside is characteristic of the 55 and older senior population in the City of El Segundo which (based on the 2000 Census) represents 15.7 percent (2,519) of the total 16,033 population. Based on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), El Segundo is required to provide 168 additional housing units during the current housing cycle (2006-2014). The allocation of the 168 units is broken down into five categories as follows: 22 extremely low income households, 22 very low income households, 27 low income households, 28 moderate income households, and 69 above moderate income households. The City has a total of 43 units that can be credited toward the above moderate income requirements for the current 2006-2014 planning period.

The units in this project will be used to meet a portion of the need in the extremely low, very low, and low income household category which represent a proportional total of 31 percent, 31 percent, and 38 percent respectively, of the total RHNA allocation for the lower income categories. These same percentages were applied to the unit totals for this project. Thus, if 304 units are built under Option 1, a total of 46 units would be required as follows: 14 units (31% of the total 15%) for the extremely low income senior household category; 14 units (31% of the total 15%) for the very low income senior household category; and 18 units (38% of the total 15%) for the low income senior household category to be split equally between the assisted living and townhome/apartment units. If all 58 units are built under Option 2, a total of 6 units comprised of 2 units in each income category would be required (extremely low – 31% of the total 10%; very low – 31% of the total 10%; and low – 38% of the total 10%). Developer must still provide 15% set aside for the total number of units constructed for Option 1 and 10% set aside for the total number of units constructed for Option 2 should fewer units than the maximum allowed be constructed. The units must be distributed in the same percentage ratios as specified above in the low, very low, and extremely low income categories. Percentages for the total number of units and for each income category must be calculated by rounding to the nearest whole number not to exceed the maximum required percentage. Any affordable housing units that are required based on the single-family component of Option 2 may be satisfied by developing the requisite number of units in other components of the project.

The developer must submit an income and verification monitoring plan to the Director of Planning and Building Safety before building permits are issued.
The southern .33 acre "tail" of the Project Site will be developed in accordance with the existing provisions of the Multi-Family Residential (R-3) Zone. The remaining 5.32 acres will be developed in accordance with the following:

A. Permitted Uses

1. Senior Dwellings consisting of apartments or condominiums.
2. Senior Housing consisting of assisted and/or independent living units.
3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

B. Permitted Accessory Uses

1. Wireless communication facilities subject to ESMC Chapter 15-19.
2. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.
3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

C. Site Development Standards

1. Lot Coverage/Density

The Senior Housing Community development on the 5.32 acre parcel cannot exceed a total of 175,000 square feet combined, with a 0.75 total FAR. The exact mix of housing options is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with the Specific Plan but the development totals cannot exceed the maximum density analyzed in the EIR.

2. Lot Area

The minimum lot area is 15,000 gross square feet.

3. Height

No building or structure can exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height, with the exceptions of parapets and other auxiliary structures that cannot exceed forty-five (45) feet in height.

4. Setbacks

a. Front Yard along East Imperial Avenue: 20-foot minimum.

b. Side Yard: 40-foot minimum.

c. Rear Yard: 40-foot minimum between the southern side of the Specific Plan area and the R-3 uses to the south.
6. **Building Area/Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

   The total net floor area of all buildings cannot exceed the total square footage of the property multiplied by 0.75.

7. **Off-Street Parking and Loading Spaces**

   Off-street parking and loading spaces, including parking for employees and visitors must be provided as follows:

   **Senior Dwellings (Market Rate):**
   - 1 space per studio/1 bedroom units
   - 2 spaces per 2 bedroom units

   **Senior Dwellings (Affordable):**
   - 0.5 space per studio/1 bedroom units
   - 1 space per 2 bedroom units

   **Senior Housing Assisted Living Units (Market Rate):**
   - 1 space per 2 units/2 beds

   **Senior Housing Assisted Living Units (Affordable):**
   - 1 space per 3 units/3 beds

**D. Design Features**

   Assisted Living facilities will contain the following design features:

   - Kitchen
   - Dining Room
   - Library
   - Restrooms
   - Exercise Area
   - Recreational Facilities consisting of:
     - Game Playing Area
     - Pool
     - Open Space consisting of: landscaped courtyards and other passive recreational areas
   - Within each individual dwelling unit a kitchenette consisting of a minimum of refrigerator, sink and microwave
Senior Residential facilities will contain the following design features:

- Pool
- Community Room
- Lobby
- Mail Room

**Mixed Residential Development Option (Option 2)**

**A. Permitted Uses**

1. Single-Family units and/or multi-family housing units consisting of apartments, townhomes, or condominiums.

2. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

**B. Permitted Accessory Uses**

1. Any use customarily incidental to a permitted use.

2. Detached accessory buildings and structures, including private garages.

3. Other similar uses approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety, as provided by ESMC Chapter 15-22.

**C. Site Development Standards**

1. **Density**

   The Mixed Unit Development cannot exceed a maximum of twenty-four (24) single-family units and thirty-four (34) multi-family units. The exact mix and layout of housing is determined through the Site Plan Review application procedure submitted in accordance with the Specific Plan.

2. **Lot Area**

   The minimum lot area for single family residential is 5,000 gross square feet.

   The minimum lot area for multi-family residential is 7,000 gross square feet.

3. **Height**

   Single-family residential dwelling units must comply with the existing height standards set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-4A.

   Multi-family residential dwelling units cannot exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height.
4. **Setbacks**

Setbacks for single-family residential dwelling units, in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4A, for multi-family residential dwelling units, in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-4B.

5. **Lot Frontage**

Each lot developed with multi-family residential dwellings must have a minimum frontage on a street of 50 feet.

Each lot developed with single-family residential dwellings must have a minimum frontage on a street of 50 feet.

6. **Building Area/Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

The maximum net floor area permitted for single-family residential buildings and multi-family residential building must comply with ESMC Chapters 15-4A and 15-4C, respectively.

7. **Off-Street Parking and Loading Spaces**

Off-street parking and loading spaces must be provided in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-15.

**GENERAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR EITHER DEVELOPMENT OPTION**

A. **Landscaping**

Landscaping must be provided as required by the existing provisions of ESMC Chapters 10-2 and 15-2.

B. **Walls and Fences**

All walls and fences must comply with ESMC § 15-2-4. Decorative masonry, open work wrought iron and similar materials are permitted. The use of chain link and razor wire is prohibited.

C. **Access**

All development projects must provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. In addition, all development projects must provide pedestrian access between buildings and transit facilities located on site and/or off site, if within adjoining public rights-of-way.

D. **Signs**

Signs located in the Specific Plan area must comply with the requirements of ESMC Chapter 15-18.
E. Energy Standards

The development must be built to a minimum of LEED Certified standard or such other equivalent standard determined by the Director of Planning and Building Safety. LEED stands for the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System developed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) and provides a suite of standards for environmentally sustainable construction.

F. Design Standards

The following minimum design standards must be incorporated in all projects within the Plan area:

1. All colors, textures, and materials on exterior elevation(s) must be coordinated to achieve a continuity of design throughout the 5.32 acre portion of the Project Site, regardless of whether the units are developed at the same time.

2. The buildings must have contrasting accent features that use at least two primary exterior building materials (including, without limitation, stucco, stone, rock, and brick) and/or two exterior colors.

3. Building materials must be of non-reflective coatings and glazings and windows must use low-reflectivity glass.

4. Plans must be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning and Building Safety for compliance with these Design Standards. If the Director finds that such plans are non-compliant, an applicant may appeal that decision in accordance with the ESMC.

G. Phasing

The housing on the entire 5.65 acre Project Site may be developed in one or more phases.

H. Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Option 1, the Senior Housing Community/Multi-Family Residential (R-3) project, must provide two bulletin boards, display cases or kiosks displaying transportation information located where it is visible to the greatest number of residents and employees (one within the assisted living development and one within the senior residential development). Information in the area must include, without limitation, the following:

1. Current maps, routes and schedules for public transit routes serving the site;

2. Telephone numbers for referrals on transportation information including numbers for the regional ridesharing agency and local transit operators;

3. Ridesharing promotional material supplied by commuter-oriented organizations;
4. Bicycle route and facility information including regional/local bicycle maps and bicycle safety information; and

5. A list of facilities available for carpoolers, vanpoolers, bicyclists, transit riders, residents and pedestrians at the site.

4.3 MODIFICATIONS

The following requirements apply to Option 1 and to Option 2:

A. Minor Modifications/Administrative Approvals

The Developer may make minor changes to the Project and Project Approvals ("Minor Modifications") without amending this Specific Plan upon the administrative approval of the Director of Planning and Building Safety or designee, provided that such modifications are consistent with the Development Standards, Applicable Rules and Project Approvals.

B. Major Modifications

Unless such modification is approved in accordance with subsection A above or is a use approved subject to an Administrative Use Permit, any proposed modification to the Project which results in any of the following do not constitute a Minor Modification but constitute a Major Modification and require an amendment to this Specific Plan:

1. Any decrease in the required building setbacks;

2. Any increase in the total developable square footage or FAR of the entire Property for either project option;

3. Any increase in height of buildings or structures on the Property above thirty-five (35) feet with the exception of parapets and other auxiliary structures that cannot exceed forty-five (45) feet in height;

4. Any decrease in the minimum required lot area;

5. Any decrease in the minimum required lot frontage;

6. Any change in use to a use which is not permitted herein;

7. Any deviation from the uses and development standards or limitations set forth in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2 of this Specific Plan, except to the extent these Sections specifically provide for the Council or the Director to approve of such changes;

8. Any material modification to Developer's obligation to provide LEED certification, or such other equivalent standard as determined by the Director of Planning and Building Safety for the Project; or
9. Any material modification that requires modifications to the EIR other than an Addendum.

10. Other than the Major Modifications listed above, all other modifications to the Project are considered "Minor Modifications."
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION

5.1 OVERVIEW

In order to develop a project that is in conformance with the uses, density and FAR approved in this Specific Plan, a Site Plan Review ("SPR") application must be filed with the Department of Planning and Building Safety. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the approved conceptual plans.

5.2 APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW - CONTENTS

The Site Plan Review Application must be submitted in conformance with applicable City application requirements and must include all information deemed necessary by the Director of Planning and Building Safety to address site plan review criteria. The plans must be in substantial conformance with the approved conceptual plans.

5.3 SITE PLAN REVIEW – PROCEDURE

A. The Director of Planning and Building Safety must review an application to ensure there is consistency with the Specific Plan within 30 days after it is submitted.

B. CEQA Review, if required, must be conducted within the time frames set forth in the Public Resources Code and the California Code of Regulations.

C. The Site Plan Review must be timely scheduled for public hearing before the Planning Commission, which date cannot exceed 30 days after the completion of the public review period of the environmental documentation, if any, or within 30 days from the date the application is deemed complete if no further environmental review is required. The Planning Commission must render its decision in writing, either approving, approving with conditions, or denying the Site Plan Review application, stating the reasons for such action. The decision of the Planning Commission is final unless appealed to the City Council.

D. Any aggrieved person may appeal the Planning Commission's decision to the City Council. Such appeal must be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Building Safety within ten days after the date of the written decision by the Planning Commission. Upon receiving such an appeal and the payment of the appropriate filing fee, the matter must be scheduled for consideration by the City Council not more than 45 days after the date of receipt of the appeal.

E. The Site Plan is valid for two years from the date of approval. If construction has not commenced within such time, but the applicant has diligently pursued the project plan review process, the Director of Planning and Building Safety may extend the precise plan of design for up to one additional year.

F. Subsequent to the approval of the Site Plan, the Director of Planning and Building Safety may approve minor changes in the Site Plan or the conditions thereof if he finds that there are practical reasons for such changes, that such changes do not substantially vary from the previously approved site plan and applicable City codes and that such changes do not involve deviations from the design's intent.
5.4 SITE PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA

The purpose of the Site Plan Review procedure is to ensure that the development provides a cohesive visual identity and coordinated design character for the Specific Plan area of high quality. The overall coordinated design character must be expressed in the site planning, architecture, landscaping, lighting, and signage. The architectural design is to be compatible in character, massing and materials consistent with the conceptual plan depicted in this Plan. The architectural design must provide a residential character that complements the surrounding uses and integrates the residential uses with the neighborhood to ensure that the project does not have the appearance of a suburban subdivision with a single uniform architectural building design. A minimum of two distinct architectural styles and building designs must be used for the single-family uses in Option 2 and two distinct architectural style and building designs must be used for the multi-family uses in Option 2. The site design should maximize setback distances of buildings and parking spaces from the existing surrounding residential development to the east, west and south to the extent feasible, minimize the reduction of on-street parking in relationship to driveway placement, and distribute the placement of required landscaping throughout parking areas.

In approving the Site Plan Review the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal, must consider the following factors:

A. The dimensions, shape and orientation of the parcel;
B. The placement of buildings and structures on the parcel;
C. The height, setbacks, and bulk of buildings;
D. The building materials and design;
E. The distance between buildings or structures;
F. The location, number and layout of off-street parking and loading spaces;
G. The internal traffic patterns and pedestrian safety features;
H. The location, distribution, amount and type of landscaping materials and the sustainability of the landscaping material with the El Segundo climate in compliance with the applicable climate zone;
I. The placement, height and direction of illumination of light standards;
J. The location, number, size and height of signs;
K. The location, height and materials of walls, fences or hedges; and
L. The location and method of screening refuse and storage areas, roof equipment, pipes, vents, utility equipment and all equipment not contained in the main buildings of the development.
5.5 Approval Criteria

The Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal, will approve the Site Plan if it finds that the site plan, architecture and landscape design, with conditions if necessary are consistent with the Project Description and development standards set forth herein.

5.6 General Administration

Unless regulated by this Specific Plan, development will be administered and enforced by the City in accordance with the ESMC. This Specific Plan supersedes any conflicts with ESMC zoning regulations.

A. The Director of Planning and Building Safety may grant administrative use permits in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-22.

B. The Director of Planning and Building Safety may make other administrative determinations using the same procedures set forth in ESMC Chapter 15-22.

C. The Director of Planning and Building Safety may grant adjustments and administrative adjustments in accordance with ESMC Chapter 15-24.

5.7 Amendment

In accordance with the Government Code §§ 65450-65457, Specific Plans must be prepared, adopted and amended in the same manner as General Plans except that Specific Plans may be adopted by resolution or by ordinance.

This plan may be amended as necessary by ordinance. Said amendment or amendments do not require a concurrent General Plan amendment unless the Director of Planning and Building Safety determines that the proposed amendment would substantially affect General Plan goals, policies, objectives or programs.
City Submittal

August 30, 2016
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AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget (including all City Revenues and Expenditures), and Adoption of Resolution approving the 2016-2017 Final Operating and Capital Improvement Budget and the 2016-2017 Appropriations Limit. Copies of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Preliminary Budget can be found in the Library, City Clerk’s Office, and on the City’s website. (Fiscal Impact: Total Revenues (including transfers-in) of $112,571,276, Total Expenditures (including transfers-out) of $123,112,234; General Fund Revenues of $67,836,559, Expenditures (including transfers-out) of $69,810,355)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
2. Approve the General Fund Reserve Policy (Attachment C).
3. Approve the Economic Uncertainty Reserve Policy (Attachment D).
4. Direct staff to return with an updated employee classification and salary schedule.
5. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
B. Schedule of Budget Changes
C. General Fund Reserve Policy
D. Economic Uncertainty Reserve Policy


Amount Budgeted: n/a
Additional Appropriation: n/a
Account Number(s): None

ORIGINATED BY: Joseph Lillio, Finance Manager
REVIEWED BY: Joseph Lillio, Finance Manager
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager
BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

**FY 2016-2017 Budget**

The City started the budget process by holding a Strategic Planning Session on June 22 and August 3, 2016. Also, budget study sessions were held on August 29 and September 6, 2016. During these sessions, staff presented assumptions and estimates that would be used to develop the FY 2016-2017 Operating Budget, and identified additional critical items for funding consideration. Based on decisions at this planning sessions, Council prioritized critical needs and identified items to be included in the FY 2016-2017 Preliminary Budget. On September 20, 2016, City Council conducted a Public Hearing on the FY 2016-2017 Operating and Capital Improvements Budget and staff presented a preliminary budget for revenues and expenditures, along with the assumptions and additional positions and items as approved by Council from prior meetings.

On the September 20, 2016 budget hearing, City Council directed staff to fund an additional $2,811,100 in projects related to infrastructure, technology and marketing. The technology component totals $256,100, which is being placed in a holding account within the non-departmental General Fund budget. The technology items to be funded from this holding account will be brought before City Council at a subsequent Council meeting for discussion and approval. Also, City Council approved budget for a staffing reclassifications and new positions totaling $562,367, of which $360,167 will be put in a holding account within the non-departmental General Fund budget. These positions will be brought before Council at a subsequent Council meeting for further discussion.

Revisions since the Preliminary Budget presented on September 20, 2016 have been made to the General Fund expenditures and are attached to this report. The final amounts by department and by fund have been included in the final budget to be adopted by resolution.
RESOLUTION NO._______


The City Council of the City of El Segundo does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1: The City Council finds and declares as follows:

A. The City Council has reviewed the proposed final Operating Budget ("Budget") for fiscal year;

B. The Budget is based upon appropriate estimates and financial planning for the City's operations, services, and capital improvements;

C. The City Council conducted strategic planning sessions on June 22 and August 3, 2016; budget study sessions on August 29 and September 6, 2016; a public hearing on September 20, 2016; and continued the public hearing to September 28, 2016;

D. All procedural requirements for adopting the City's budget were fulfilled, and the City Council was fully informed regarding the City's current finances, projected revenue, and financial obligations; and

E. It is in the public interest for the City Council to adopt the Budget as proposed by the City Manager.

SECTION 2: ADOPTION. The Budget attached to this Resolution, and incorporated by reference, is approved and adopted subject only to the authorities set forth below. Such approval and adoption includes, without limitation, the Schedule of Positions Full-Time & Full-Time Equivalents by Department, Authorized Positions and Budgeted Positions set forth in the Budget which recognizes Authorized Positions which are authorized but not necessarily budgeted and Budgeted Positions which are authorized and budgeted in the fiscal year.

SECTION 3: APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT.

A. Article XIIIB of the California Constitution requires the City to set its Appropriations Limit on an annual basis;

B. The City's Appropriations Limit may be adjusted annually based upon inflation and population growth.

C. The City Council may choose the method of calculating adjustments to the City's Appropriations Limit on an annual basis. For inflation, pursuant to Article XIIIB, § 8(e)(2), adjustments to the Appropriations Limit may be calculated using either the percentage change in per capita personal income from the preceding year or the percentage change in the local assessment roll from the preceding year because of local nonresidential new construction. For population growth, pursuant to Government Code§ 7901(b), the City may either use the percentage
growth either in its jurisdiction or from the surrounding county.

D. Pursuant to Article XIII-B of the California Constitution, and those Government Code sections adopted pursuant to Article XIII-B, § 8(f), the City Council chooses to adjust the City's Appropriations Limit by calculating inflation using the percentage change in per capita personal income from the preceding year and calculating population growth by using the percentage change in population in Los Angeles County.

E. As a result of the adjustments made to the City's Appropriations Limit, the City Council sets the Appropriations Limit for the fiscal year at $310,451,878.

SECTION 4: BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS. Based upon the Budget, the total General Fund operating budget, including transfers-out, is $69,810,355. The City Manager, or designee, is authorized to implement the following appropriations for City Departments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>$286,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>412,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Treasurer</td>
<td>319,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>1,387,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>488,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Department (*includes one-time capital outlay of $461,100)</td>
<td>6,446,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Center</td>
<td>1,448,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>1,309,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1,907,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>15,114,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>817,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2,315,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Building Safety</td>
<td>2,647,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>19,240,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>7,250,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
<td>5,757,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers-Out</td>
<td>2,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,810,355</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 5: CIP APPROPRIATIONS. Based upon the CIP, a total of $9,374,000 is appropriated for Capital Improvement Projects for Fiscal Year. The City Manager, or designee, is authorized to implement the CIP with the following funds and amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIP Fund (301)</td>
<td>$2,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Gas Tax Fund (Fund 106)</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants (Fund 125)</td>
<td>484,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fund (Fund 501)</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Fund (Fund 502)</td>
<td>2,930,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6: MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS. The City Manager, or designee, is authorized to implement the following miscellaneous appropriations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSET FORFEITURE (109)</td>
<td>657,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP A TRANSPORTATION (112)</td>
<td>293,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP C TRANSPORTATION (114)</td>
<td>105,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.O.P.S. FUND (120)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE GRANTS (125)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR POLLUTION REDUCTION (115)</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL SOUND INSULATION (116)</td>
<td>198,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPERION MITIGATION (117)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES MAINTENANCE (405)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE FUND (202)</td>
<td>545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER FUND (501)</td>
<td>26,722,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER FUND (502)</td>
<td>3,557,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLF COURSE (503)</td>
<td>1,936,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT (601)</td>
<td>5,527,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITY INSURANCE (602)</td>
<td>1,602,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS' COMP RESERVE/ INSURANCE (603)</td>
<td>2,188,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$43,927,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 7: FUND OPERATING RESERVES. The City Manager, or designee, may appropriate any remaining revenues at the close of Fiscal Year 2016-2017 into the applicable Fund operating reserve on September 30, 2017.

SECTION 8: APPROPRIATIONS LAPSE. All appropriations shall lapse at the end of the fiscal year to the extent that they have not been expended or lawfully encumbered unless approved by the City Council.

SECTION 9: BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS. The Budget may be subsequently adjusted as follows:

A. By majority vote of the City Council;

B. By the City Manager, or designee, for all appropriation transfers between programs and sections within a City department and between appropriation units (e.g., salaries and benefits, services and supplies, and capital outlay) within programs;

C. By Department Directors for appropriation transfers between appropriation units within programs;
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D. Object code expenditures within appropriation units in a program are not restricted so long as funding is available in the appropriation unit as a whole.

SECTION 10: CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

A. The City Manager, or designee, is authorized to bid and award contracts for the equipment, supplies, and services approved in the Budget.

B. In accordance with the El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC"), the City Manager is authorized to execute all contracts awarded for equipment, supplies, and services approved in the Budget.

C. Notwithstanding any dollar limitation set forth in the ESMC, the City Manager is authorized to execute contracts for purchasing equipment and supplies that are individually identified in the Budget regardless of total cost. The City Manager may, but is not required to, seek additional City Council approval for transactions made pursuant to this Section.

D. For all other services, equipment, and supplies, the City Manager is authorized to execute contracts in accordance with the ESMC.

SECTION 11: DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY. Pursuant to State of California Code Section 53607, the City Council hereby authorizes the City Treasurer to invest and reinvest the City's funds, to sell or exchange securities so purchased, and to deposit securities for safekeeping in accordance with the Code. The City Treasurer may delegate all, or a portion of the investment authority to subordinates pursuant to State of California Government Code Section 41006. Such delegation by the City Treasurer shall not remove or abridge the Treasurer's investment responsibility. This Delegation of Authority shall be valid for one year unless otherwise revoked; and will be renewed on an annual basis in conjunction with the Budget Adoption.

SECTION 12: The City Clerk is directed to certify the adoption of this Resolution; record this Resolution in the book of the City's original resolutions; and make a minute of the adoption of the Resolution in the City Council's records and the minutes of this meeting.

SECTION 13: This Resolution will become effective immediately upon adoption and will remain effective unless repealed or superseded.

PASSED AND ADOPTED September 28, 2016.

[SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE]
RESOLUTION NO. _____ PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of September 2016

Suzanne Fuentes, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
MARK D. HENSLEY, City Attorney

By: ________________________
   David King
   Assistant City Attorney
I, Tracy Weaver, City Clerk of the City of El Segundo, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Resolution No. was duly passed and adopted by said City Council, approved and signed by the Mayor, and attested to by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said Council held on the 28th day of September, 2016, and the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

________________________________________
Tracy Weaver, City Clerk
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO  
PROPOSED BUDGET RECONCILIATION  
FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved:</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>COPS Fund:</th>
<th>Summary: All Funds</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Joe's total as presented</td>
<td>$ 66,599,643</td>
<td>As presented</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$ 69,810,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>Station video storage</td>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture</td>
<td>657,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD/RMS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prop A</td>
<td>293,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Fund:</td>
<td>Prop C</td>
<td>105,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>As presented</td>
<td>AQMD</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk Records Tech</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>Replace RSVP vehicle</td>
<td>RSI</td>
<td>198,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Park PT</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Interoperability network</td>
<td>Hyperion Mitigation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF Paramedic</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Maintence</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSI</td>
<td>(17,125)</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshall</td>
<td>(56,787)</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>517,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement Fund:</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>(21,775)</td>
<td>As presented</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>2,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>(32,068)</td>
<td>CAD/RMS</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>30,022,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>$ 67,009,088</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>6,487,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>1,936,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS director</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>Water Fund:</td>
<td>General Liability</td>
<td>1,602,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip Mechanic</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>As presented</td>
<td>Workers Comp</td>
<td>2,188,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS specialist</td>
<td>95,667</td>
<td>2 Water Maint Workers</td>
<td>Equip Replacement</td>
<td>5,527,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Engineer</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>Reclass Admin Specialist</td>
<td>Total All Funds</td>
<td>$ 123,112,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks reclass</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm cameras/license plate readers</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>256,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating</td>
<td>$ 67,750,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP transfer</td>
<td>2,060,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Fund Revised</td>
<td>$ 69,810,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/22/16
Attachment C

General Fund Balance Policy

Purpose - To mitigate current and future risks and to ensure a balanced budget

While our financial reserves provide us security against unexpected emergencies and contingencies, our policies for setting those target levels should be periodically reviewed to balance our community’s level of risk tolerance against our operating expenditure needs.


2. For Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2018, increase the target General Fund Unreserved, Undesignated Fund Balance at a minimum of 18% of General Fund Expenditures, with a maximum target of 20%.

3. For Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2019, increase the target General Fund Unreserved, Undesignated Fund Balance at a minimum of 18% of General Fund Expenditures, with a maximum target of 20%.

4. The long-term General Fund reserve policy objective is to increase the target General Fund Unreserved, Undesignated Fund Balance to 20% of General Fund Expenditures.
Attachment C

*Balanced Operating Budget*

The City Council's policy is that General Fund annually adopted Appropriations must not exceed General Fund annually adopted Estimated Revenues.
Economic Uncertainty (Revenue Offset) Reserve Policy

**Purpose** - To mitigate current and future risks due to fluctuations in the City’s core tax revenues (net of Chevron). These core revenues are Sales and Use Tax, Business License Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax, Franchise Tax, and the Utility Users Taxes.

Based on a staff recommendation the City Council has elected to adopt a Revenue Offset Reserve Policy to address the instability of the City’s Core Revenues.

1. For Fiscal Year ending September 30, 2017, increase the Economic Fund Uncertainty Balance to $1,500,000 by transferring $250,000 from General Fund Revenues, if after the fund balance calculation there is available excess fund balance to transfer.

2. Thresholds established:
   a. Minimum balance of $1,500,000.
   b. The maximum balance shall be $2,000,000.

3. Once target level is reached, reevaluate the appropriate funding level each fiscal year during the budget adoption process.

**Use of Reserves**

This policy requires that these funds be used for balancing the General Fund Operating Budget in those years when the core revenues are experiencing downward swings.

Annually, to determine if the Fund reserves should be used to offset revenue loss, staff will calculate the baseline 10-year rolling average for the aggregate of the 5 revenue categories. In a year that the revenues are under performing to this calculation reserves will be transferred to the General Fund to offset this loss of revenue and reported to Council during budget adoption.
ATTACHMENT D

If revenues are over performing to this calculation the above minimum, maximum and target level funding instructions should be followed. The excess revenue shall be used to achieve the maximum reserve funding level ($2.0 M).
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT

MEETING DATE: September 28, 2016
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding approval of an examination plan for Fire Paramedic. Fiscal Impact: None.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Approve the proposed examination plan.
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: N/A

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>$ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Martha A. Dijkstra, Human Resources Director
REVIEWED BY: Martha A. Dijkstra, Human Resources Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:
The new classification of Fire Paramedic was approved by Council at its meeting on December 1, 2015, as part of the approval of a successor Memorandum of Understanding between the City of El Segundo and the El Segundo Firefighters’ Association (FFA) for the term October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2017.

The Fire Department wishes to initiate the selection process to fill current and anticipated vacancies in this new classification. As a result, staff is asking Council to approve the proposed examination plan in accordance with Section 1-6-9, Examinations, of the El Segundo Municipal Code which states that the Personnel Officer shall review and recommend to the City Manager, who in turn shall recommend to the City Council, an appropriate examination plan and weights for each portion of the examination.

Examination Plan

1. Fire Paramedic
   - Written Test
   - Structured Technical Interview

   Open-Competitive
   Closed-Promotional
   20%
   80%

Approval of exam plans for Merit System job classifications in all City Departments has been required since the passage of Initiative Ordinance No. 586 in April 1962.
For departments other than Police and Fire, the plan may consist of any one or combination of the following techniques:
   1. Written;
   2. Oral;
   3. Demonstration; and
   4. Any evaluation of education, experience, or skills or physical fitness, which fairly evaluated the relative capacities of the applicants.

Police and Fire Departments: The examination plan, for entrance or promotional, for the Police and Fire Departments, shall consist of a written examination and one or more of the following:
   1. Oral;
   2. Demonstration; and
   3. Any evaluation of education certification, experience, or skills or any test of manual skills or physical fitness, which fairly evaluates the relative capacities of the applicant.
EL SEGUNDO CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA STATEMENT
MEETING DATE: September 28, 2016
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:
Consideration and possible action regarding a request for off-site and on-site sale of beer and wine (Type 41 ABC License) for a proposed restaurant at 204 Main Street, EA No. 1166, AUP No. 16-11. Applicant: Brewport Group, LLC. (Fiscal Impact: N/A)

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION:
1. Receive and file this report for the on-site and off-site sale of beer and wine at a new restaurant at 204 Main Street; and/or
2. Alternatively, discuss and take other possible action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
1. Crime and Arrest Statistics by Reporting Districts (RD)
2. Police Reporting Districts Map

FISCAL IMPACT: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number(s):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINATED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
REVIEWED BY: Sam Lee, Planning and Building Safety Director
APPROVED BY: Greg Carpenter, City Manager

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

I. Background

On September 1, 2016, the Director of Planning and Building Safety approved an Administrative Use Permit application (EA-1166, AUP 16-11) for 204 Main Street with conditions of approval, which allows the on and off site sale of beer and wine at the new restaurant (Type 41). The Director’s decision was forwarded to the Planning Commission on September 8, 2016, and the Planning Commission Received and Filed the Director’s decision.

Under California law, once the Department of Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) receives an application for a license, ABC must notify the applicable local city council, law enforcement agency and planning department of the pending application with ABC (Bus. & Prof. Code § 23987). The city council or local agency then has 30 days to review and, if applicable, protest the issuance of the license. The grounds of a protest, if any, should relate to public health, safety or welfare concerns. On August 9, 2016, the applicant applied for a Type 41 license with the
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC). On September 7, 2016, ABC notified the City of the application and inquired about the entitlement processed required by the City.

In 1995, the City Council directed staff to bring all future Department of ABC licenses to it for review. On August 29, 2016 the ABC 30-Day Public Notice was posted at the site and is set to end on September 30, 2016. Staff is providing information regarding this language in the event the City Council desires to object to the issuance of the license.

II. Analysis

The application for a license, if approved by the Department of ABC, would allow the sale of beer and wine to guests sitting at in the indoor dining area and the two outdoor dining areas located in the front and the rear of the building. The front outdoor dining area will be 68 square feet and the rear patio will be 308 square feet. The proposed business hours for the restaurant, which includes the sale of beer and wine are Monday through Thursday, 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.; Friday, 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m.; Saturday, 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m.; and Sunday, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. Food must be served during hours of business and when beer and wine service is offered.

According to the most recent Crime and Arrest statistics report prepared by the Police Department, the proposed restaurant is located in Reporting District (RD) 113. Based on the January – June 2016 data reported by the Police Department, the district had a total of 14 Part I & II crimes and 7 felony/misdemeanor arrests. The RD 113 has experienced a 5% increase in overall crime compared to the same reporting period for 2015. The Police Department and the Planning and Building Safety Department do not object to the issuance of the Type 41 ABC License for the new restaurant.

The project site is located in the Downtown Specific Plan. The proposed use (off-site sale and on-site sale of beer and wine at a restaurant), required the approval of an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with Section VI(A)(4)(a) and (b) of the Plan. As noted above, the permit was approved with conditions, by the Director of Planning and Building Safety and the Planning Commission.

ABC license review requires mandatory findings that are regulated by ABC. The City’s AUP process is separate. ABC is responsible for running a complete background check on all alcohol license applicants, as well as conducting site inspections, before issuing any type of alcohol license.

III. Environmental Review

The project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations § 15301 as a Class I categorical exemption (Existing Facilities). The project is a request for a beer and wine permit only for a new restaurant.
IV. Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Council receive and file this report without objecting to the issuance of a new Type 41 ABC license for the on and off site sale of beer and wine at a new restaurant at 204 Main Street or alternatively discuss and take another action related to this item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING DISTRICT</th>
<th>PART I &amp; II CRIMES</th>
<th>FELONY/MISD ARRESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AVERAGE BY RD PERCENTAGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>240%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>681</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td><strong>1009</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Reporting Districts = 52
Average # of Part I & II Crimes per Reporting District = 13
Average # of Felony/Misdemeanor Part I & II Crime Arrests per Reporting District = 6
Average # of Crimes and Arrests per Reporting District = 20
(Results from 01/01/2016 through 06/30/2016)
EL SEGUNDO PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING DATE: September 8, 2016
AGENDA STATEMENT
AGENDA HEADING: Consent Agenda

AGENDA DESCRIPTION:

Director of Planning and Building Safety Decisions for Administrative Use Permit.

RECOMMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

1. Receive and File the Director’s decision; and/or
2. Discuss and take any other action related to this item.

ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

1. Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 16-11 Approval Letter
2. Design Review Approval Letter
3. Proposed Menu
4. Plans

ORIGINATED BY: Louis Morales, Contract Project Planner
REVIEWED BY: Gregg McClain, Planning Manager
APPROVED BY: Sam Lee, Director of Planning and Building Safety

I. INTRODUCTION

The Director of Planning and Building Safety issued the following decisions:

1. Approved - Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166 and Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 16-11.

An Administrative Use Permit to allow the on and off-site sale and consumption of alcohol at a proposed restaurant.

Address: 204 Main Street
Applicant: Brewport Group
Property Owner: HJM International, LLC

The proposed project is located in the Main Street Transitional District (MSTD) of the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP). The request is for approval of an Administrative Use Permit No. AUP 16-11 for the off-site and on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine within a proposed 2,334 square-foot restaurant located within an existing 5,540 square-foot building, formerly occupied by the U.S. Post Office. The restaurant will consist of 1,112 square feet of indoor dining area, a 68 square-foot outdoor front patio, and a 308 square-
foot rear outdoor patio. The restaurant is a permitted use in the DSP and can occupy the existing space without providing additional parking. However, since the project proposes outdoor dining in excess of 200 square feet the project will be required to pay the Parking In-lieu fee for three parking spaces. The applicant proposes minor changes to the exterior of the building. The improvements to the front of the building will be limited to the installation of an aluminum awning with matte black finish and recessed lighting. The front of the building will also have horizontal oak railing on black metal post to define the 68 square-foot front outdoor patio that will encroach 30 inches into the public right-of-way. The rear of the building will remain the same and proposes to utilize the existing loading dock area as an outdoor patio approximately 308 square feet. The rear outdoor patio will have oak screen with alternating heights and will incorporate material to minimize any potential noise. On September 1, 2016, the Director approved the Design Review application for the outdoor dining and minor façade improvements.

The proposal is to sell beer and wine in conjunction with a proposed restaurant. The restaurant will offer 37 beer taps and 9 wine taps to be used for consumption on-site as part of the restaurant operation. The restaurant will also have a retail component and will offer the same tap beers and wines served in the restaurant in bottles that will be located in the display coolers for off-site sales. The restaurant will be limited to the sale of beer and wine (Type 41) and must operate as a restaurant to comply with the permitted uses and current parking restrictions for permitted uses. The proposed hours of operation and the sale of beer and wine are: Monday through Thursday from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.; Friday from 11 a.m. to 1 a.m.; Saturday from 9 a.m. to 1 a.m.; and Sunday from 9 a.m. to 12 a.m. Food must be served during hours of beer and wine service. The applicant plans to apply for a Type 41 (On sale beer and wine – Eating Place) Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) license.

II. RECOMMENDATION

Receive and File. In the alternative, any planning commissioner may request that this item be discussed and a decision on the application be made by the Planning Commission instead of received and filed.
September 1, 2016

Mr. Kristian Krieger
The Brewport Group, Inc.
204 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166 and
Administrative Use Permit AUP No. AUP 16-11

An Administrative Use Permit request to allow the sale of alcohol for
off-site and on-site consumption at a proposed restaurant

Address: 204 Main Street

Dear Mr. Krieger:

In accordance with El Segundo Municipal Code ("ESMC") Chapter 15-22,
the Planning Division reviewed your application for the above-referenced
project and the Director of Planning and Building Safety APPROVED
Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166 and Administrative Use Permit
No. AUP 16-11 for the sale of beer and wine for off-site and on-site
consumption in conjunction with a proposed restaurant at 204 Main Street.
The following are the findings and facts in support of each finding for this
decision:

FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS:

Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166

Finding 1

- The proposed project is categorically exempt from the requirements of
  the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to 14
  California Code of Regulations § 15301 as a Class 1 categorical
  exemption (Existing Facilities).
Facts in Support of Finding 1

1. The applicant proposes the on-site and off-site sale of beer and wine within a proposed restaurant located at 204 Main Street. The subject property is developed with an existing 5,540 square-foot commercial building that was once entirely occupied by the U.S. Post Office. Since the departure of the U.S. Post office, the building was subdivided into two spaces. Kristian Krieger, dba the Brewport Group (the "Applicant") is proposing to occupy northern tenant space, which is approximately 2,334 square feet. The property is located in the Main Street District (MSD) of the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) where restaurant and retail uses are permitted by right. The project involves the addition of 376 square feet of outdoor dining area, which requires provision of three (3) additional parking spaces. The site cannot provide any additional parking spaces therefore the Applicant will be required to pay the Parking In-Lieu fee for the three (3) parking spaces to satisfy the parking requirement for the proposed outdoor dining patios. There is adequate access and all public services and facilities are available. The site is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impacts with regard to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

2. Beer and wine will be served and consumed in the following locations of the restaurant:
   a. The Dining area: 1,112 square feet
   b. Outdoor Front Patio area: 68 square feet
   c. Outdoor Rear Patio area: 308 square feet

Administrative Use Permit 16-11

Finding 1

- There is compatibility of the particular use on the particular site in relationship to other existing and potential uses within the general area in which the use is proposed to be located.

Facts in Support of Finding 1

1. The applicant proposes to sell beer and wine for off-site and on-site consumption inside the restaurant and outdoor dining areas.

2. The proposed restaurant use is situated in an existing building within the DSP area that includes offices, retail uses, and restaurants. There are residential uses located across an alley way east of the subject property.
3. The proposed restaurant use is a permitted use in the DSP. Since the restaurant is a permitted use no additional parking spaces are required for the request other than the three (3) spaces required for the proposed outdoor dining areas.

4. The General Plan Land Use designation for the site is Downtown Specific Plan. The zoning for the site is Downtown Specific Plan. On-site and off-site sale of beer and wine is permitted in the Zone with the approval of an Administrative Use Permit.

5. The DSP permits restaurants by right and alcohol sale and consumption with an AUP. The surrounding land uses include: restaurants, residential, and commercial retail. The existing restaurants in close proximity to restaurants that offer and serve alcohol in their establishments. Given the presence of residential (12 units) located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed restaurant, the on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine at the rear outdoor patio will be required to be properly screened to minimize sound levels.

Finding 2

- The proposed use is consistent and compatible with the purpose of the Zone in which the site is located.

Facts in Support of Finding 2

1. The zoning for the site is Downtown Specific Plan. The proposed restaurant use with sale of beer and wine for off-site and on-site consumption requires an Administrative Use Permit in accordance with the DSP.

2. The DSP has a vision statement for the Downtown which is to provide a better balance of uses to service the residents, maintain a safe and secure environment, facilitate economic development, promote a compatible mix of uses, and avoid the blight of vacancies. The proposed use and its proposed operations are consistent with the goals since it expands quality retail and restaurant facilities in proximity to major employment centers. In addition, the proposed use is economically viable and environmentally safe, fills the void of a vacant downtown space, and provides a stable tax base.

3. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU1-4 in that it preserves and maintains the City's Downtown and historic areas as integral to the City's appearance and function.

4. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Goal LU4 in that it provides a stable tax base for the City through development of new commercial uses, and primarily within a mixed-use environment, without adversely affecting the viability of Downtown.
5. The proposed use is consistent with Land Use Element Objective LU4-1 in that it promotes the development of high quality retail facilities in proximity to major employment centers. Therefore, for all of the foregoing reasons, the use is consistent and compatible with the purpose of the Downtown Specific Plan.

Finding 3

- The proposed location and use and the conditions under which the use would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Facts in Support of Finding 3

1. The on-site sale of alcohol will be offered both inside the proposed restaurant dining area and in the outside patio areas and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and regulations. The proposed restaurant will offer thirty-seven (37) specialty beer taps and nine (9) wine taps to be used for consumption on-site. In addition the restaurant will offer the same tap beers and wines in bottles for retail sales (off-site). The project does not propose any structural change to the exterior of the building and will include the installation of an awning on the front façade and the inclusion of railing on the perimeter of the proposed outdoor patios. There will be no changes to the building envelope or parking area. The proposed restaurant and retail use are both permitted uses and may operate with the current supply of on-site parking, however the Applicant will be required to pay the Parking In-lieu Fee for three (3) parking spaces that will be required for the outdoor dining patios in compliance with Downtown Specific Plan VII(3)(b)(iii).

2. The surrounding land uses include commercial retail, residential and restaurants. The proposed sale of beer and wine requires an AUP and the restaurant is a permitted use within the Downtown Specific Plan.

3. The proposed hours of operation of the restaurant that will also serve beer and wine is: Monday through Thursday, 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.; Friday, 11 a.m. to 1 a.m.; Saturday 9 a.m. to 1 a.m.; and Sunday 9 a.m. to 12 a.m. Beer and wine will be served within the restaurant dining area and outdoor patios. The proposed hours of operation are within the range of hours established for other similar uses in the Downtown Specific Plan Area. No live entertainment is proposed. The use is also subject to certain conditions outlined in this approval letter.

4. Because the location of the proposed restaurant is surrounded by both commercial and residential uses and the proposed on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine will be contained at the restaurant and will not extend into the late-night hours beyond those hours established in the approved AUP, the proposed location and use, as conditioned, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.
Finding 4

- Potential impacts that could be generated by the proposed use, such as noise, smoke, dust, fumes, vibration, odors, traffic, and hazards have been recognized and mitigated.

Facts in Support of Finding 4

1. The on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine will not create any new impacts that would not be normally associated with the operation of a restaurant. Potential noise impacts have been addressed by requiring a sound screen at rear patio and incorporated as condition No. 28.

The proposed hours of operation and beer and wine sales are limited to Monday through Thursday, 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.; Friday, 11 a.m. to 1 a.m.; Saturday 9 a.m. to 1 a.m.; and Sunday 9 a.m. to 12 a.m.

2. The property is currently improved with on-site parking. Since the restaurant and outdoor dining uses are permitted uses within the DSP, the Applicant must comply with the parking requirements for any additional or proposed square footage beyond the existing building. The Applicant will be required to pay the Parking In-Lieu fee for three (3) parking spaces resulting from the outdoor dining patios pursuant to DSP Section VII(3)(c)(ii).

3. In addition to complying with the requirements of the City of El Segundo and the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control the restaurant is subject to County Health Department regulations that address and monitor impacts of fumes and odors. Thus, all potential impacts that could be generated by the proposed use have been recognized and mitigated.

Finding 5

- The State Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control has issued or will issue a license to sell beer and wine to the Applicant.

Facts in Support of Finding 5

1. The Applicant must obtain a license from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control for on-site sale and consumption of beer and wine for restaurants (Type 41).

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING SAFETY DEPARTMENT ACTION

Based on these findings and facts in support of these findings, the Director of Planning and Building Safety Department APPROVES the proposed project, subject to the following conditions:
1. The business must operate and maintain the licensed premises as a bona fide eating (restaurant) place at all times as defined by ESMC § 15-1-6. Should the restaurant stop operating as a restaurant at any time, the AUP will become void and the on-site sale of beer and wine will require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and will be required to provide the required parking of 36 parking spaces or pay the Parking In-lieu Fee for the 36 parking spaces less any applicable credits.

2. The hours of operation to sell alcohol for on-site and off-site sale is limited to Monday through Thursday, 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.; Friday, 11 a.m. to 1 a.m.; Saturday 9 a.m. to 1 a.m.; and Sunday 9 a.m. to 12 a.m. Any change to the hours of operation or the hours that beer and wine may be served is subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

3. Any subsequent modification to the project as approved must be referred to the Director of Planning and Building Safety for approval and a determination regarding the need for Planning Commission review of the proposed modification.

4. Any subsequent changes to the floor plan and areas where beer and wine will be served and consumed must be reviewed and approved to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety. The serving of beer and wine will be allowed in the 1,112 square-foot indoor dining area, 68 square-foot outdoor front patio, and in the 308 square-foot outdoor rear patio. The Kitchen must remain open and offer meals at all times when the business is open.

5. No entertainment or dancing is permitted in the outdoor dining area without prior approval pursuant to Title 4, Chapter 8 of the ESMC.

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW IS NOT A PLAN CHECK REVIEW. Plan check review requires submittal of complete construction documents and calculations. Questions concerning exiting, fire-resistance, and occupancy must be presented to the Building and Safety Division in writing accompanied by appropriate plans.

7. Additional requirements will be included when complete drawings are submitted for Plan Check. The applicant and/or project designer is responsible for ensuring that all mandatory information required for permit issuance has been addressed on the plans.

8. No tables, chairs, umbrellas, etc., for outdoor dining may be placed in areas required for ingress and egress as required by the latest adopted California Building Code.

9. All projects shall comply with El Segundo Municipal Code (including Residential Noise Insulation Standards), and the 2013 edition of the California Building Code, California Residential Code, California Electrical Code, California Mechanical
Code, California Plumbing Code, California Green Building Standards and Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

10. Construction projects must comply with Best Management Practices for construction and storm-water runoff requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System MS4 Permit.

11. Plans submitted for plan check must be stamped by State-licensed architect or engineer and shall include:
   
   • Complete structural calculations, details, notes and material specifications.
   
   • A statement from a (Certified Access Specialist) CASp indicating that a plan review has been performed and that it complies with the requirements of Chapter 11A &11B of the CBC. (Specifically, verify that the seating and parking meet the accessible requirement of 11B of CBC)

12. A maximum encroachment of 30" into the public right-of-way is allowed. This will affect the proposed front outdoor patio. The front outdoor patio must comply with Condition No. 9 as noted.

13. The applicant must ensure that encroachment permits required by the City are secured from the Public Works Department before commencing any and all work in the public right-of-way, including any lane closure.

14. The proposed improvement will affect the existing sewer main lines. The applicant must submit a sewer study that shows the capacity deficiency in the affected existing sewer lines. Necessary sewer upgrades will be determined once the sewer study is reviewed and approved.

15. Any unused water or sanitary sewer laterals shall be abandoned and properly capped at the City main. The contractor is to obtain necessary permits and licenses, and provide traffic control plans and shoring plans.

16. A utility plan shall be provided that shows all existing and proposed utility lines and their sizes (sewer, water, gas, storm drain, electrical, etc.) including easements, around the project site.

17. All construction-related parking must be accommodated on-site. No construction related parking shall be permitted off-site.

18. All record drawings (As-built drawings) and supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Public Works Engineering Division prior to scheduling the project’s final inspection.
19. The applicant must obtain and maintain all licenses required by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (Business & Professions Code §§ 23310 et seq.).

20. The restaurant operations must comply with ESMC §§ 7-2-1, et seq. regulating noise and vibration. No amplified sound is permitted in the outdoor dining areas.

21. The Planning and Building Safety Department and the Police Department must be notified of any change of ownership of the approved use in writing within 10 days of the completion of the change of ownership. A change in project ownership may be cause to schedule a hearing before the Planning Commission regarding the status of the administrative use permit.

22. The applicant must comply with all regulations of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and the regulations promulgated by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board including, without limitation, the regulations set forth in 4 Cal. Code of Regs. §§ 55, et seq.

23. There must be no exterior advertising of any kind or type, including advertising directed to the exterior from within, promoting or indicating the availability of specific alcoholic beverage products. Interior displays of alcoholic beverages which are clearly visible to the exterior will be screened accordingly.

24. All employees serving beer and wine to patrons must enroll in and complete a certified training program approved by the State Department of Alcoholic Beverages Control (ABC) for the responsible sales of alcohol. The training must be offered to new employees on not less than a quarterly basis.

25. Any and all employees hired to sell beer and wine must provide evidence that they have either:

   a. Completed training from the State of California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), Lakewood District Office administered Leadership and Education in Alcohol and Drugs (LEAD) Program in the form of an ABC-issued certificate; or,

   b. Completed an accepted equivalent by the ABC, Lakewood District Office to ensure proper distribution of beer, wine and distilled spirits to adults of legal age. If any prospective employee designated to sell alcoholic beverages does not currently have such training, then;

   c. The ABC-licensed proprietors must have confirmed with the Planning and Building Safety Department within fifteen (15) days of the Director's decision, or by final project approval, that a date certain has been scheduled within the local ABC Office to complete the LEAD course.
d. Within thirty (30) days of taking said course, the employees, or responsible employer must deliver each required certificate showing completion to the Police Department.

26. The licensee must have readily identifiable personnel to monitor and control the behavior of customers inside the building premises. Staff must monitor activity outside in the parking lot and any adjacent property under the establishment's control to ensure the areas are generally free of people.

27. The applicant must pay the parking in-lieu fee for the three (3) parking spaces noted before the City issues a Certificate of Occupancy, pursuant to Ordinance No. 1429 and City Council Resolution.

28. The applicant must install a sound/screen wall at the rear outdoor patio. The screen wall will incorporate clear glass or plexi-glass type material to off-set any potential noise impacts to the residential uses resulting from the use of the patio.

29. If complaints are received regarding excessive noise, parking availability, lighting, building access, and the like associated with the sale of beer and wine, the city may, in its discretion, take action to review the Administrative Use Permit, including without limitation, adding conditions or revoking the permit.

30. The building must not be occupied by more persons than allowed by the California Building Code, as adopted by the ESMC.

31. The building and any outdoor seating must comply with California Building and Fire Code requirements, as adopted by the ESMC.

32. The Applicant, The Brewport Group, Inc., agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from and against any claim, action, damages, costs (including, without limitation, attorney's fees), injuries, or liability, arising from the City's approval of Environmental Assessment No. 1166 or Administrative Use Permit AUP No. 16-11. Should the City be named in any suit, or should any claim be brought against it by suit or otherwise, whether the same be groundless or not, arising out of the City approval of EA-1166 or AUP 16-11, the Applicant agrees to defend the City (at the City's request and with counsel satisfactory to the City) and will indemnify the City for any judgment rendered against it or any sums paid out in settlement or otherwise. For purposes of this section "the City" includes the City of El Segundo's elected officials, appointed officials, officers, and employees.

33. Brewport Group, Inc. must acknowledge receipt and acceptance of the project conditions by executing the acknowledgement below.

By signing this document, The Brewport Group, Inc. certifies that he has read, understood, and agrees to the Project Conditions listed in this document
FURTHER ACTION

This determination is scheduled to be received and filed by the Planning Commission at its September 8, 2016 meeting. Please be advised that this does not conclude the review process. The City Council will determine whether or not to protest the approval of the beer and wine permit at its meeting at an as of yet undetermined date.

Should you have any questions, please contact Louis Morales, Contract Planner, at (310) 524-2351.

Sincerely,

Sam Lee, Director
Department of Planning and Building Safety
September 1, 2016

Mr. Kristian Krieger
The Brewport Group
204 Main Street
El Segundo, CA 90245

RE: Environmental Assessment No. EA-1166 and Miscellaneous Application No. MISC 16-10 - A Downtown Design Review for outdoor dining areas and to allow for modifications to the exterior of a building

Address: 204 Main Street, El Segundo, CA 90245

Dear Mr. Krieger:

After reviewing your application in accordance with the Downtown Specific Plan Design Standards, the Director of Planning and Building Safety has APPROVED your request for the following exterior changes which are reflected in the project plans on file with the Planning Division:

1. The exterior façade changes include the installation aluminum awning with matte black finish with recessed lighting and the development of a 68 square-foot outdoor dining at the front of the building with oak railing and the development of a rear 308 square-foot outdoor dining area with vertical oak screening. The front outdoor dining area will encroach 30" inches into the public right-of-way and will be a total of 5'-0" deep. The project will consist of a proposed restaurant with the proposed minor modifications to the exterior building at the front/rear side of the property:

   a. The restaurant will be approximately 2,334 square feet with a total dining area of 1,112 square feet of indoor dining and 376 square feet of outdoor dining area.
b. The existing glass windows at the front will remain the same.

c. The existing exterior white stucco with graphics will remain the same.

d. New signage, including any window and perpendicular/pedestrian signs) must not exceed an aggregate total of twenty-five (25) square feet maximum.

e. The installation of horizontal oak railing finished with marine grade sealer and supported by black metal post will surround the front outdoor patio.

f. The rear outdoor patio will have vertical oak screen finished with marine grade sealer and will vary in height from 3'-0" and 7'-0." The screen will include a clear glass or plexi-glass type material to mitigate any sound resulting from the activity at rear the outdoor patio.

g. Signs will be submitted under a separate permit.

h. Any subsequent changes to the approved design features noted in this letter must be reviewed and approved to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Safety.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Louis Morales at (310) 524-2351.

Sincerely,

Sam Lee, Director
Planning and Building Safety
Brew Port Market Menu
"A Social Dining Experience"

Pre-Boarding Appetizers (Starters)

*International Cheese & Charcuterie Board: Assorted Salami, prosciutto, aged asiago, Brie, English cheddar, Sicilian olives, w/sliced Bread Bar baguette..................................................$X.xx

*Domestic Cheese & Charcuterie Board: Aged Wisconsin cheddars, Cow Girl Creamery Mt. Tam, Point Reyes Blue, Applegate uncured pepperoni, La Spanola Chorizo, Jim Town Fig Spread, w/ sliced Bread Bar Mediterranean Ciabatta.......$X.xx

*Heirloom Tomato Bruschetta w/ Mediterranean Ciabatta crostini’s..................................................$X.xx

*Fresh Rice Paper Rolls (Seasonal) : Asian style veggies W/ smoked salmon ......................$X.xx

*Ahi Poke w/ everything flat bread........$X.xx

*Bay Shrimp Ceviche w/ Bread Bar Crostini....$X.xx
*Seasonal Carousels: sliced pinwheel Tortilla bread wrap with smoked turkey, smoked ham, red leaf lettuce, red onions, tomatoes, avocado, blue - Montgomery cheese & mayo..................................$X.xx

*****

Salads & Sides:

*Couscous or Tabouli w/ Panini Grilled Seasonal Veggies.................................................................$X.xx

*Edamame Salad w/ green onions, chick peas, long grain wild rice, green peas & Asian vinaigrette..........................................................$X.xx

*Gundo Classic Caesar: Romaine, Garlic croutons, cherry tomatoes, red onion, Caesar dressing, shaved Parmesan...........................................$X.xx

*Fresh Seasonal Slaw: (Asian veggies, Broccoli, Cabbage, Carrot, Jicama)...........................................$X.xx

*Heirloom Tomato Salad w/ Red Onion, Cucumber, sliced fresh Buffalo Mozzarella w/ Italian vinaigrette..........................................................$X.xx
*Arugula, Goat Cheese, Fresh Spinach, chopped Red Bell Pepper, assorted dried fruits & walnuts w/ fig vinaigrette.........................................................$X.xx

*Fresh Seasonal Fruit Salad.....................................$X.xx

*****

Brew Port Destination Grilled Sandwiches

*The Albuquerque: Hatch Chilies, Cheddar, Red Onions, Mayo, Provolone & Tomatoes on Marin Sourdough.................................................................$X.xx

*When In Rome: Mozzarella, Pepperoni, Provolone, Salami, Tomatoes, Pepperoncini, Italian dressing on Ciabatta..............................................$X.xx

*The Windy City: Applewood Smoked Ham, Baby Swiss, Apricot Jam, Beer Mustard on Sierra Rye.................................................................$X.xx

*The Wall St. Meltdown: Corned Beef, Jarlsburg Cheese, Sour Kraut, Sweet Onion Mustard on Sierra Rye.........................................................$X.xx
*The Golden Gate: Taleggio cheese, Ham, Havarti Cheese, Prosciutto, sweet onion, sliced granny smith apple, mayo on Rustic Sourdough........$X.xx

*The French Quarter: Smoked Gouda, Muenster Cheese, Roasted Red Peppers, Arugula w/ Mayo & Mustard on French Baguette..........................$X.xx

*Get Gina's Goat: Drunken Goat Cheese, Cow Girl Cheve, Arugula, Fresh Spinach, Chive Mayo on Rustic Sourdough............................................$X.xx

*The Strip: Roasted Beef, Horseradish Cheddar, Red Onion, American Cheese, Sliced Tomato, Mayo on Pretzel Bread.............................................$X.xx
The Brew Port Market Sandwich Landing Strip!

"You build it and it will come!

All sandwiches are available to be Panini grilled!

* 

Bread Bar Breads: (Choose one)

* Baguette
* Rustic "Lafayette" Golden West sandwich sliced
  * Mediterranean Ciabatta
  * Sierra Rye
* Outland Hearth Buckwheat Bread
  * Weldon Organic Wheat
  * Marin Sourdough

All Natural Boars Head Meats:

* Oven roasted Turkey Breast
  * Hickory smoked Turkey Breast
  * Tuscan roasted Turkey Breast
    * Applewood Smoked Ham
      * Uncured Ham
    * Top Round Roasted Beef
All Natural Applegate Natural Meats:
- Genoa Salami
- Pepperoni
- Prosciutto
- Soppressata Salami

All Natural Cheese:
- American
- Provolone
- Pepper Colby / Jack
- Horseradish Cheddar
  - Mozzarella
- Blue Montgomery Jack
- Lacy Baby Swiss
- Sharp Cheddar
- Emmentaler Swiss
  - Havarti
- Muenster Kase

Sandwich Toppings:
*Red / Green leaf lettuce
*Tomato
*Fresh Spinach
*Avocado
*Red Onion
*Sliced Pepperoncini
*Bean Sprouts
*House Hummus

Condiments:
*Mayonnaise (Assorted)
*Deli Mustard (Assorted)
*Fig Spread
*Garlic Aioli
*House Hummus

The Landing Desserts
*NY Cheesecake
*Mrs., Hovie's Toffee
*Sepulveda Brownies
*Allison's Gourmet Waffles
*KK's Artisan Popcorn