AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, April 4, 2018

El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Ben Chuaqui, Patrick Riley, John Thompson, and Glenn Wood.

1. Comments from the Public
   (Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes)

2. Approval of Minutes
   Approval of the minutes of the February 7, 2018.

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   This time on the agenda is reserved for Board Members to disclose communications from individuals regarding specific agenda items or to state a potential conflict of interest in relation to a specific agenda item.

4. Public Hearing – 10810 San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL16-0119
   Applicant: Mauricio De la Pena, Trachtenberg Architects
   Location: 10810 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 503-010-015
   Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of a Tier IV Design Review proposal of a four story residential building containing a total of 40 units, and 32 new garaged parking spaces. Rooftop open space is proposed on the Kearney Street elevation.
   CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION

To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Margaret Kavanaugh-Lynch, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530  Tel: (510) 215-4330
E-mail: mkavanaugh-lynch@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
Public Hearing – 10963 San Pablo Avenue

Application: PL17-0084
Applicant: Buddy Williams, Studio KDA Architects
Location: 10963 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 509-110-015, 017
Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid Intensity Mixed Use district (TOMIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of a Tier II Design Review proposal of a five story residential building containing 50 units, and 34 new garaged parking spaces. A public plaza is proposed along the Jefferson Street elevation.
CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182.

5. Staff Communications

6. Adjournment
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, February 7, 2018
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call: Chair: Carl Groch; Board Members: Maggie Leighly, Patrick Riley, John Thompson and Glenn Wood.

1. Comments from the Public
   No comments were received.

2. Approval of Minutes
   Motion to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2017 meeting: Thompson; 2nd Wood
   Vote:
   Ayes: Groch, Thompson, Wood
   Noes: None
   Abstain: None
   Absent: Leighly, Riley

3. Board Member Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   Nothing was reported.

4. Public Hearing – 1613 Elm Street Duplex
   Application: PL17-0021
   Applicant: Kevin Stong
   Location: 1613 Elm Street
   Zoning: RD (Duplex Residential)
   General Plan: Medium Density Residential
   APN: 502-211-012
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of the creation of a duplex
   CEQA: The project is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15270(a), projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.

   Consulting Planner, Elizabeth Dunn, presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

   Kevin Stong, applicant and architect for the project, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.
City of El Cerrito
Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

Sarah Gong, property owner of 1613 Elm Street.

The public hearing was closed.

The Design Review Board provided revisions to the project.

Motion to approve the item with the revisions: Thompson, 2nd: Wood.
Vote:
Ayes: Groch, Thompson, Wood
Noes: None
Absent: Leighly, Riley
Abstain: None

5. Staff Communications
Staff updated the board about upcoming meetings and upcoming projects.

6. Adjournment
8:35pm
DESIGN REVIEW Tier IV Staff Report  
April 4, 2018  
10810 San Pablo Avenue

DETAILS

Application Number: PL16-0139

Applicant: Mauricio de la Pena, Trachtenberg Architects

Location: 10810 San Pablo Avenue

APN: 503-010-015

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier IV Design Review project, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

CEQA: This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier IV Design Review project, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Tier IV review is intended to allow high-quality new development projects that would not otherwise be allowed under a strict interpretation of the Specific Plan Tier II regulations but nevertheless comply with the intent of the Specific Plan and that help ensure the City's long-term financial sustainability.

The Planning Commission and Design Review Board both have authority under Tier IV. The Planning Commission approved the project at their February 21, 2018 meeting. Discussion of the meeting is included in this staff report.

The proposed project includes 40 new residential units in a building that is three and four stories tall, with rooftop private open space, and 32 garage parking spaces.

The project requires Tier IV Design Review approval from the Design Review Board. This review includes authority over the following elements only:

- Limitations regarding building height, form and massing;
- Limitations regarding view blockage of the key views listed in Section 2.05.02.03 Views;
- Building facades and articulation;
- Exterior building colors and materials;
- Landscaping, including use and design of open spaces;
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way;
- Signs

Based on the information in this report which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses. The project is a part of the existing 160 unit Village at Town Center (“Village”) residential development located on three separate parcels on Schmidt Lane. The project specific location extends through the entire block from San Pablo Avenue to Kearney Street, along Schmidt Lane. The site slopes up gently from San Pablo Avenue.

The approximately 1.38-acre (60,060-square-foot) site of the Village at Town Center campus setting (consisting of Buildings A – D) has four addresses. The address for the project site is 10810 San Pablo Avenue, and is comprised of one parcel (APN 503-392-028) that is north of Schmidt Lane and fronts on Kearney Street. The site is 24,958 square feet (0.57 acres), and developed with covered and uncovered parking spaces for existing residential Building A at the Village residential development. Vegetation within the project site consists of planted islands within the parking area and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs around the perimeter of the project site. The proposed building would be Building E of the Village project.

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan, and is zoned as TOMIMU in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan as well. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed use development with a 55-foot height limit.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The overall site is bounded by three streets: San Pablo Avenue, Schmidt Lane, and Kearney Street. The project site is accessed from Kearney Street, the street frontage that applies to the discussion about this project, and is 293 feet in length. San Pablo Avenue features an existing AC Transit bus stop (Lines 72 and 72M).
Existing/Previous Land Use

The site had historically been used as the El Cerrito Mill and Lumber site. A newly constructed Italianate style building, The Vitale Building, had been on the site until the Village at Town Center was about to start construction; this building was relocated across the street. In 2001, the current campus was approved for the site.

Adjacent Land Uses

North: Senior multi-family housing (under construction), and City of El Cerrito City Hall.

East: El Cerrito office of the Department of Motor Vehicles building; residential uses.

South: Schmidt Lane. Residential uses along Schmidt, and commercial immediately to the south.

West: San Pablo Avenue with commercial uses that are in the cities of El Cerrito and Richmond.

Analysis

Project Description
The proposed project would be Building E, and part of the Village at Town Center residential development. The project sponsor proposes to demolish the existing surface parking lot, and develop the site with a new three and four-story residential building which includes 40 dwelling units, 32 covered parking spaces, and a large private-common open space area on the roof. The proposed Building E would be comprised of an H-shaped building that is linked by elevated walkways over the on-site drive aisle. The project would result in the construction of a three and four story residential building with 40 market-rate apartment units and ground-level parking located on the northern portion of the project site. The proposed project would include 30 one-bedroom apartments and 10 two-bedroom apartments.
for a total of 40 residential units. The ground level would include 32 garaged parking spaces. A community Amenity Room is proposed on the ground floor level along the Kearney Street elevation for all of the tenants of the residential buildings that comprise the Village at Town Center campus. Sixty (60) long-term bicycle parking spaces are located in a storage room that fronts onto Kearney Street. The trash room is also located along the Kearney Street elevation to the north of the bike storage area.

Unique Considerations

This project is unique in that it is contained within an existing mixed-use, multi-family campus. To that end, it presented several challenges and opportunities. As new multi-family housing is being added to the existing site plan, it is required to apply the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan standards to the building envelope of the new building. However, the new building shares its other development parameters with the rest of the campus. While staff notes the opportunity to implement a key goal of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and replace surface parking for high quality multi-family housing, the project’s analysis had to ensure the site plan-level impacts, such as vehicle parking and open space ratios, did not go below the development standards for the Plan area. Finally, it was essential to safeguard parking needs of the existing commercial uses along San Pablo Avenue and the five below market rate dwelling units located in Building A.

Off-Street Parking

The Village at Town Center project was originally approved by the City Council in 2001, and received approval from the City’s Design Review Board in 2003 for the Building A site (the site of the proposed project). The approved number of parking spaces for the whole project (Buildings A – D) was 227 spaces over four parcels to serve a total of 160 dwelling units. Therefore, the approved parking ratio was 1.42 parking spaces per unit.

If the proposed Building E is approved, 40 additional dwelling units will be added to the project. Some surface parking will be removed and new garage parking spaces are being added. The net new number of parking spaces for the campus will decrease to a total of 200, however 8 of these spaces are for the retail uses that are along San Pablo Avenue. Therefore, the parking ratio is .96. The Transit Oriented Medium Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) district requires additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures when the proposed parking ratio is between 0-1. Additional TDM measures have been identified in a TDM Plan prepared by a Transportation Engineer and included in Attachment 5, specifically:

1. The Village at Town Center will compile and distribute information regarding all TDM measures to residents through provision of a TDM Contact Person and Tenant Welcome Packet. They will also be responsible for employing a full-time Transportation Coordinator to educate their residents on the measures included in the TDM Plan.

2. The Village at Town Center budgeted $50,000 to provide Clipper Cards to residents.

3. The Village at Town Center will coordinate with a Car Share and Bike Share vendors to provide a car share space on-site for residents, commercial building tenants, and the public to utilize.

The project sponsor will be required to collect data and make monitoring reports available for review by the City of El Cerrito annually for five years, once the project is 85% occupied.

With this TDM Plan in place, the report concluded that the on-site parking will be sufficient to meet the parking need.
Looking specifically at the Building A portion of the campus, there are 86 covered and uncovered parking spaces, five of which are accessible. With the proposed project, a total of 59 garaged and uncovered parking spaces for the residential and commercial uses will be available for use at this location, and 27 parking spaces are eliminated with the construction of a new residential building. The table below shows the breakdown of the existing and proposed parking spaces for the project site and campus.

**Table of Existing and Proposed Parking for the Project Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table of Existing and Proposed for the Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off street parking at this site also has two other factors that are being considered in the project: 1) there are eight (8) dedicated off-site parking spaces for the commercial uses along San Pablo Avenue with the reconfigured on-site parking adjacent to this corridor; and 2) there are five (5) lower income units that have an existing contractual arrangement to use five garaged spaces.

In keeping with the regulations of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the balance of the covered and surface parking spaces, including the accessible spaces, are unbundled from the lease of the residential dwelling units.

**Open Space**

The Village at Town Center project was approved with the private and common open space regulations that were in effect at the time. Areas for public open space uses were not required. The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan requires a ratio of private/common open space per unit for the residents of the development and a ratio of public open space for the benefit of the general public.

Staff analyzed the previously approved plans and applicable regulations from the previous Zoning Code to understand the amount of private and common open space that was created for the Village at Town Center project.

**Existing Condition**

A total of 22,386 square feet of open space was established for the Village at Town Center campus project (15,040 square feet of shared open space, and 7,346 square feet of private open space).

Applying the current private/common open space ratio of the Specific Plan to the existing campus and proposed project, 16,000 square feet of private/common open space would be required for the 160 existing dwelling units. Therefore, there is currently a surplus of 6,386 square feet of private/common open space area for existing campus project.

**New Project**

New private common rooftop open space is provided as part of this project. This space is located above the third floor on the building, and consists of a variety of new landscaping (trees and shrubs that are
drought tolerant), eight (8) seating areas with outdoor furniture (that is modular), barbeques, storage trunks, an outdoor television and a dog play area. This area is 3,600 square feet in size, and exceeds the requirement of 80 square feet of private/common open space per unit by 400 square feet.

In addition, the applicant proposes to enhance an existing 5,400 square foot turf area with a bocce court, fire pits, and new landscaping. As noted above, this space was previously designated as public open space in the application. The project developer now proposes that the courtyard area will remain private, common open space. To meet the development standard of public open space, an in-lieu fee, of $119,694.00, will be paid for the 1,173.47 square feet of public open space that is required of the project for the proposed new Building E.

Table of Existing and Proposed Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Campus</th>
<th>Required/Proposed</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Common</td>
<td>22,386 sq ft</td>
<td>3,200 sq ft/3,600 sq ft</td>
<td>16,000 sq ft is required for the existing campus. 3,200 sq ft is required for the new dwelling units 25,986 sq ft is provided. Surplus of 6,786 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,173 sq. ft./0</td>
<td>An in-lieu fee of $119,646.00 will be paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:

- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which includes private, common and public open spaces.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:

- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards. Standards below that are shown in **bold** text show components of the project that do not comply with the Specific Plan standards. Standards that shown in _underlined_ text illustrates where the project greatly exceeds the minimum expectations set by the Specific Plan.
Although the campus is located on many public rights of way, the project is located on Kearney Street, north of Schmidt Lane, which is a Neighborhood Street. The project is located in the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) Transect Zone.

### Neighborhood Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</strong></td>
<td>5 ft. min</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</strong></td>
<td>6 ft. min adjacent to commercial uses, 5 ft. min adjacent to residential uses</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Activity Zone</strong></td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses Entries on front or side streets</td>
<td>1 ft., 1” 1’, 1” for a residential use One (1) new building entry on Kearney Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Front Setback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Access</strong></td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways. Side access on corner lots</td>
<td>One new curb cut that is 20 ft. wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Setbacks</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>Proposed project cast shadows beyond the curb line on the opposite side of Kearney Street on December 21 at 1:30pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
<td>12 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
<td>9 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Length</strong></td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
<td>133’, 10’ ft. along Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>25% min</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>2 ft. max</td>
<td>2 ft. 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Front Yard, Forecourt (NE side), Flex (commercial), Shop Front (commercial)</td>
<td>Flex Front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the purposes of administering the development standards detailed above, the Zoning Administrator has determined that Kearney Street is the front of the project site, and in the event of a conflict, the Neighborhood Street standards prevail.

### Open Space Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min</td>
<td>3,200 sq. ft. required; 3,600 provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall surplus for the campus of 6,786 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Open Space

| 25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings >25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 1,173 sq. ft. required) |
| 1,173 sq. ft. of public open space required; an in-lieu fee of $119,694.00 will be provided to the City for the public open space. |

Note: Open space for this project is calculated based on the proposal and the entire campus. See discussion.

Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Height

| Maximum Height | 55 ft. max |
| Minimum Height | 3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial | 4 residential stories |

Design Review Process

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the Design Review Board is authorized to review and act upon the Design Component of Tier IV applications. Generally, this review includes authority over the following elements:

- Limitations regarding building height, form and massing;
- Limitations regarding view blockage of the key views listed in Section 2.05.02.03 Views;
- Building facades and articulation;
- Exterior building colors and materials;
- Landscaping, including use and design of open spaces;
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way;
- Signs

As each Tier IV project will be different in terms of what components need to be considered under the Planning Commission purview, the Design Review Board purview for this project’s design is also unique to this project.

In this application, the following aspects have been previously approved by the Planning Commission:
Daylight plane (upper floor massing);
- Allowed frontage type along Neighborhood Street;
- Ground floor ceiling height and frontage type; and
- Front encroachment above ground floor on Neighborhood Street.

All other aspects of the elements listed above remain in the purview of the Design Review Board.

Planning Commission Approval and Comments

On February 21, 2018, the Planning Commission reviewed the application as part of the Tier IV Design Review process. The Commission’s purview consisted of the site plan, the aspects of the project that do not meet the development standards of the Form-Based Code of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, and making a determination whether the project achieves an over-arching public benefit. The Commission approved these aspects of the project with a unanimous 7-0 vote. The Planning Commission was supportive of the project with respect to the landscaping proposed by the project, and the enhanced turf area adjacent to Building A with the bocce court and fire pits, and landscaping. The Commission did not have any specific comments or aspects of the project to modify as part of the project review by the Design Review Board.

Architectural Design

The building’s architecture incorporates a strong contemporary aesthetic. It is in the shape of an “H”, with a common hallway on the second, third, and fourth floors between the two areas of this building. Stairways will exist within both portions of the building and an elevator is located in the four story portion of the building. A new exterior door at the ground floor on the west elevation has been added which allows residents to gain access to the building from either San Pablo Avenue or Schmidt Lane without having to use the main lobby on the Kearney Street elevation. A gate has been created at the end of the walkway from the building which allows residents to follow a new pathway to gain access to San Pablo Avenue. Residents who may have mobility issues can use the ADA walkway to the north of the courtyard area to gain access to Schmidt Lane or San Pablo Avenue. Bicycle parking for the proposed Building E, and an Amenity Room for all of the residents at the Village campus exists on the ground floor on the Kearny Street elevation.

The building features upper floors with pop-outs and recesses, which are visible above the ground floor. Corrugated galvanized steel is the material used for the popouts; stucco is to be used on the elevations between the window popouts and will be a deep gray with a brownish taupe hue. Aluminum windows are proposed on the building. Wood cladding is to be installed adjacent to the building entrance along Kearney Street on the east elevation, and as an accent feature on the west elevation for the height of the building, and in front of the stairwell. These elements create a strong vertical theme which provides visual interest along all frontages of this building. This vertical theme is reinforced with taller windows in the pop-out areas. The façade facing Kearney Street features a more traditional residential-type ground floor appearance with pedestrian and vehicular access to the street, and entrances points with doors for residents and bicyclists, and the various mechanical and utility uses for the building. There are no balconies, as all of the private open space has been placed on the rooftop area along the Kearney Street elevation.

A new rolling gate is proposed across the new driveway for the site. The gate will be six feet tall, constructed of perforated aluminum, and will have an interesting graphic design that is 50% transparent. Although the name is “Westcott Navy” the color is a deep gray. The end panel frames for the gate will painted solid steel over a steel frame, and the motor for the gate will be concealed behind the solid panel. The garage door for the existing driveway is to be a roll up door with aluminum framing.
and translucent glass. A new six foot tall perimeter wood fence is proposed for the northern elevation of the project site. The existing curb cut at the north end of the site will be removed, and new curb and gutter will be installed.

While the appearance of this building differs from the existing, more suburban architecture found on the balance of the residential buildings of the Village at Town Center development, the color palette is intentionally reminiscent of the surrounding campus. Specifically, the dark color of the stucco element matches the dark color of the existing color scheme found on the horizontal base band. Further, the parklex cladding matches the color of the traditional roof found on the existing campus.

### Project Rendering

![Project Rendering](image)

### Landscape Design

New street trees and accent landscaping is proposed. Three (3) new street trees, 24” box Brisbane Box trees, are proposed along Kearney Street. Two new 24” Brisbane Box trees are to be installed in the reconfigured parking area at the northwest corner of the site, north of the building that houses the commercial spaces. New landscaping, consisting of Agave Blue Glow, Senecio Serpens, and Dymondia Margaretae, will be installed in this area.

The accent landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the H-shaped building, and along the northern property line. The existing common open space adjacent to Building A has been refreshed, and consists of a two fire pit areas, with new landscaping, and a bocce court. The rooftop area of the proposed new Building E is to have fire pits, dedicated bench seating, multiple modular seating areas, and an artificial turf area for dogs to use. New landscaping is proposed near the gate that provides access to San Pablo Avenue from the western elevation of the proposed new building.

### Art in Public Places

The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50, Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The applicant will be paying an in-lieu fee in order to comply with this requirement.
Monetary Contributions to the Community

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that will be made by the applicant related to this project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These contributions are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to the Complete Streets component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.

1. The project proposes a public benefit contribution of $75,000 towards the renovation of Centennial Park, and the installation of additional bike racks along San Pablo Avenue.

2. An in-lieu fee of $119,646 to meet the required public open space for the project. While this is a development standard, since it is being paid as an in-lieu fee, the money will be given to the Public Works Department to further enhance existing and proposed public open space.

3. Art in Public Places in-lieu fee of $150,000. This money will be forwarded the City’s Arts and Culture Commission. They make recommendations to the City Council regarding the creation and location of public art in the City of El Cerrito.

4. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project. (46,939 sq ft x 5.02= $235,634) This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

5. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (40 du x $1,648=$65,920). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $646,200.

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

Complete Streets Plan

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. These improvements will be made as funds become available. For a commercial Neighborhood Street, such as Kearney Street, the improvements include pedestrian bulb-outs that decrease crossing distances for pedestrians, adding buffers from automobile traffic, and provide outdoor retail opportunities.
Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site and posted at the site on March 14, 2018. Staff has not received any comments.

Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning "programs." As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 3). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this project. The inclusion of these conditions ensures that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

Intent of the Specific Plan

In addition, the project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

*The project addresses Kearney Street with entries onto the street and landscaping improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will continue to enhance the San Pablo Avenue corridor, as a place, by bringing more residential units to this location of El Cerrito. A new pathway from the proposed building has been created which provides residents with another way to gain access to San Pablo Avenue.*

**Strategy A.4:** Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.

*The project site fronts onto Kearney Street, a Neighborhood Street. The project creates a relationship to the existing Village at Town Center residential use on the east side of the street, and will be immediately to the south of the senior housing that is under construction. With two smaller commercial shopping areas to the south of the site, which include restaurants, retail stores and a drug store with a pharmacy, the proposed project will enhance the existing commercial environment along Kearney Street and attract pedestrian activity to this area of San Pablo Avenue.*

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).
The project will provide 40 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the two El Cerrito BART stations. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will face Kearney Street, providing a pleasant pedestrian environment along the adjacent streets.

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project utilizes a large portion of a surface parking lot within an existing residential apartment complex. The balance of the project site contains three residential buildings (Building A site) at the Village at Town Center development. The proposed project will provide 40 new residential units in close proximity to public transit in the San Pablo Avenue, and the mid-town zone.

**Strategy B.3:** Build on recent and planned private and public investments.

The applicant proposes to add 40 new residential units to an existing private development, by converting surface parking into housing. Additionally, an existing turf area adjacent to Building A is being enhanced and converted to a private common outdoor area for all residents of Building A and proposed Building E of the Village campus to use. The renovation of the turf area is to create two fire pits, outdoor seating, new landscape and hardscape materials and a bocce court.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 40 new residential units by converting an existing surface parking lot into a new building in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**General Plan Compliance**

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

*The project will provide 40 new housing units on Kearney Street with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses.*

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.

**LU4.1: Mixture of Uses.** Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

*The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, public*
transit and the Ohlone Greenway. The design of the project will allow for surveillance of the street, enhancing public safety.

**LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives.** To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the two El Cerrito BART stations. The location also provides convenient walking access to local businesses.

**CD1.9: Building Design.** A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and is compatible with the existing and future residential uses to the east and north of the site.

**CD2.1: Street Frontages.** Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

The building will abut the sidewalk on Kearney Street and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto this street with a main door onto Kearney Street for stairway and lobby access. A relocated Amenity Room is proposed along Kearney Street which allows residents of the Village campus to assemble at this location. Additionally, residential units are above the ground floor and allow surveillance of the street from the units within the project.

**CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements.** Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements. The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

The project features an open rooftop deck for common/private open space above a portion of the fourth floor for residents of this structure. Enhanced private common open space, for the residents of Building A and proposed Building E of the Village campus, is being created with the renovation of existing turf area into a more active courtyard that is adjacent to Building A.

**CD3.3: Site Landscaping.** Improve the appearance of the community by requiring aesthetically designed screening and landscaping on public and private sites. Ensure that public landscaping includes entry areas, street medians, parks, and schools. Require landscaping for all private sites, yard spaces, parking lots, plazas, courtyards, and recreational areas.
The project has provided landscaping in conformance with the standards in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. New street trees will be installed along Kearney Street, at the perimeter of proposed Building E, along the northern property line, and as a buffer between the surface parking area and adjacent commercial uses.

CD3.12: Landscape Species. Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.

The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerance plants such as Crepe Myrtle, Brisbane Box, and various succulents.

CD4.2: Building Articulation. Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with building entries along Kearney Street.

CD5.1: Design Review Process. Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

The proposed project requires Tier IV Design Review approval from the Design Review Board in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

T2.1: Land Use Patterns. Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.
2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.
3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.
4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.
5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

The project will provide 40 new residences in close proximity to public transportation and local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.

T2.2: Project Design. Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.
The project will have building entries directly onto Kearney Street, and a new doorway on the west elevation of proposed Building E that allows more direct and convenient access to the adjacent bus stops along San Pablo Avenue.

H2.2: Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides high-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

H2.3: Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public transit. The project complies fully with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Required Findings

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for a Tier IV application, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable Specific Plan design standards;

As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

As discussed in this report, the proposed project will implement the following goals of the El Cerrito General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.3: Site Landscaping, CD3.12, Landscape species; CD4.2 Building Articulation; CD5.1, Design Review Process; T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, Policies H2.2, and H2.3.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL16-0119, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB 18-01 granting Tier IV Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL16-0119, a project that includes a 4-story residential building containing 40 dwelling units located at 10810 San Pablo Avenue.
Appeal Period
Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments
1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Description
3. Initial Study Checklist
4. Project Plans, dated February 13, 2018
5. CEQA Appendices found here (see website)
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER IV DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 40 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10810 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on a Neighborhood Street;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10810 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 503-010-015;

WHEREAS, on September 12, 2016, the applicant submitted an application for Tier IV Design Review;

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2017, the applicant was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2018, the Planning Commission, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, granted Tier IV Site Plan and Design Review approval to the project; and

WHEREAS, on April 4, 2018, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street type and Neighborhood Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.


Now, Therefore, Be It RESOLVED that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL16-0119, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Division:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated February 13, 2018. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs the building or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed.
   a. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

8. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of market rate residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

9. A construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees. This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit to allow this use.

Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:

10. Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2): The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone
Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.

11. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1): Implement the following BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:

b. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.
c. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
d. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
e. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
f. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
g. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.
h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
i. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.
j. Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:

k. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
l. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.
m. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
n. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program, for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator, that includes the following elements:
   a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

13. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

14. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   a. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
   c. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

   If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, “standard” samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

15. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

16. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:
   a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.

i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

17. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:

   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.

   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.

   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures that may include the following:

      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.

      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.

      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.

      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.

6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

18. The project applicant shall complete a truck turning analysis for the proposed driveway for the final site plan. This shall be illustrated on plans that are submitted for building permit issuance.

19. The project applicant shall install stop controls at all project driveways to allow for pedestrians to cross the driveway. These stop controls shall be illustrated on plans submitted for building permit issuance.

20. The project applicant shall add 15 feet of red curb north and south of the driveway on Kearney Street to allow for added visibility from parked vehicles. Additional red curbing shall be installed adjacent to the new curb cut from the trash room, and fire hydrant at the northeast corner of the property. This red curb and any associated signage must be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Manager. Installation of such kind will require the applicant to obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit. This shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed Building E.

21. The renovation of the existing 5,400 square feet of turf area for private/common open space, for the residents of Building A and proposed Building E of the Village campus that is adjacent to Building A, shall be in substantial conformance with the proposed size, layout, and site amenities as illustrated on the plans dated February 13, 2018.

22. The style of the new pedestrian gates, new rolling automobile gate along Kearney Street, and existing automobile gate along San Pablo Avenue shall all have the style that is proposed for the new rolling automobile gate along Kearney Street. This shall be reflected on plans submitted for building permit issuance.

23. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and Applicant/Developer shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to implement: 1) Distribution of transit passes (Clipper Cards); 2) designation of the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) the creation of the TDM marketing materials and the details of providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling.

The Applicant/Developer shall deposit the funds for the Clipper cards into an escrow account that is controlled by the City. Yearly compliance and reporting shall be made by the building manager to the City regarding the implementation of the TDM Plan.

24. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant/Developer will contribute a public benefit of $75,000 towards the purchase and installation of five (5) bike racks along San Pablo Avenue, and the balance will be allocated for the renovation of Centennial Park.
25. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant/Developer will contribute an in-lieu fee in the amount of $119,646 to meet the public open space requirement for the project.

**Public Works Department:**

26. Earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

27. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated February 13, 2018 comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit. Applicant shall use the updated version of the storm water control report as the last submittal was using the old template. See the following links for reference: [http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/](http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/).

28. Applicant shall provide drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage is encouraged to stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10’ from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

29. The project applicant shall be required to make a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal improvements identified by the SPASP.

30. Bike racks to be installed shall meet the current standards and details to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

31. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

32. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed off-site improvements plan.

33. All sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development’s public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards and provide continuous, gradual sidewalk width transition from abutting properties to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

34. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

35. Prior to issuance of a building permit and before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

36. New street trees must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before issuance of the building permit. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

**Building Division:**

37. Compliance with the 2016 Building and related Codes is required.
Fire Department:

38. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant/Development Team with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Provide code analysis and show on plans how “Emergency Vehicle Access” requirements are met to get within 150 feet of all portions of exterior walls of the first story.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.

c. Fire Riser Locations
   1. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between the two buildings.

d. Gates
   1. All gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   2. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas at all gates and doors.

e. Premises Identification
   1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
   2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
   1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
   2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.

g. Emergency Egress
   1. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4.
   2. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
   1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
   3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
   4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
   5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
   1. Standpipes shall be wet.
   2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
   3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
   1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
   2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
   3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
   1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
   1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
   1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.
   2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
   3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120 v Powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
   39. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant/Developer shall submit a plan for construction site security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
   40. This applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
   41. Construction of the new trash room as illustrated on the plans.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a regular meeting held on April 4, 2018, upon motion of Commissioner ____, second by Commissioner ______:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

________________________
Elizabeth Dunn, AICP
Consulting Planner
February 13, 2018

VILLAGE AT TOWN CENTER – NEW BUILDING E

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVAL CRITERIA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project consists of a new 4-story residential building, it will be part of the existing “Village at Town Center” development which consists of 4 existing buildings located on 4 separate, adjacent parcels.

The new building will include 40 dwelling units, 32 covered parking spaces, interior common areas and amenities and a large open space on the roof level.

The proposed building is approximately 34'-3" above the existing grade elevation.

The exterior existing garden area located at the center of site is proposed to be renovated.

Type of units: market rate rentals.

Architectural concept: the proposed project blends itself with the rest of the development and surrounding buildings built in 2013 by adopting the same massing and scale whilst presenting a more contemporary while modest form and materials.

“TIER IV” ELEMENTS:

The following elements vary from the “San Pablo Specific Plan” (SPASP) and qualify this project for a “Tier IV” site plan and design review:

A. Ground floor articulation.
B. Shadows.
C. Ground floor ceiling clear elevation.
D. Project encroachment.

A description of this items can be found in the “tier IV findings for approval” section in this document.
GENERAL PROJECT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL:

The project adheres in many ways to the City of El Cerrito General plan goals as well as those set forth in the San Pablo Avenue Form Base Code. Below are a series of points that describe how the project intents to align with both guidelines:

EL CERRITO GENERAL PLAN GOALS:

- The project helps conserve and improve the existing housing in the area while proposing an additional 40 units against the housing shortage in our area.
- Additional housing is inserted in an area with Mixed and commercial uses which will help local businesses.
- The site is located within proximity and walking distance of many public transit stops including BART and 7 bus lines.
- The project increases the housing density while reducing existing surface parking area while providing parking inside the building.
- All the proposed units will have the capability of serving handicapped individuals by having elevator access and adaptable capabilities.

SAN PABLO AVENUE FORM BASED CODE GOALS:

- Due to its location, the project helps maximize the use of BART and promotes the use of public transportation. The project is suitable for individuals and families that not necessarily need to own a vehicle.
- The development rentals will be consistent and competitive with the market rates in the area.
- The project presents a long term sustainable financial investment, adds funds to the local tax revenue and provides an economic injection to the area by introducing working individuals and young families in the area.
- The project improves the current private open space areas within the Village at Town Center development and includes a new outdoor roof-top gathering space for the Village at Town Center residents and their guests to use.

KEARNEY ST. FRONTAGE:

Kearney Street extends for only two blocks; from Schmidt Ln. to the Existing “Civil Plaza Apartments”. The street is fronted largely by the parking lot of the local DMV office, the City Offices as well as the police Station parking lots.

Other than those individuals specifically visiting the above locales, there is minimal vehicular and pedestrian traffic throughout this two-block span.

Based on the above, it is our belief that a commercial or retail use would prove unsuccessful at this location. It also does not properly lend itself for spaces such as front yards and porches due to the fronting use being a parking lot for a state agency. We have thus, proposed to relocate the open spaces to the roof, where much more privacy and better views are allowed.
TIER IV FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL:

A. GROUND FLOOR ARTICULATION:

The proposed project’s front is on Kearney Street, a street designated in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP) as a “Neighborhood street”. This particular street however, is only two blocks in length and mostly faces mainly parking lots and backs of buildings. Kearney Street’s configuration, includes a mid-block dead end, and continuous vehicular turn-around activated by the DMV office across the street from the project, this would seem inadequate and somewhat precarious for pedestrians who will mostly and more easily utilize San Pablo Avenue, located approximately 200’ to the West of Kearney St. and which is much more used and suitable for and by pedestrians.

Per in the SPASP, there are 3 allowable frontage types:

1. **Shop Frontage Type**: This frontage type requires that retail and commercial spaces are provided along the sidewalk.

2. **Flex Frontage Type**: Flex Frontages are designed so that ground floor retail and commercial uses may be used for temporary residential uses, and uses may be interchanged. The design flexibility allows for ground floor facades to transition between shop front requirements and residential uses.

   As mentioned above, this particular location is less than ideal for types 1 and 2.

3. **Front Yard/Porch Frontage Type**: For this frontage configuration, the facade must be set back from the right of way with a front yard. Our project would suffer a significant reduction on the number of dwelling units and would only be able to provide a front yard to a very small percentage of residential units. Moreover, the DMV parking lot across Kearney Street as well as the BART trains beyond are existing conflicting elements to the suggested front-yard configuration. The theoretical benefit of employing the Front Yard/Porch frontage type must be weighed against the loss of much needed dwelling units.

The proposed Community Room is intended to serve as a common amenity for all six Village at town Center buildings.

B. SHADOWS:

The SPASP requires that in order for a project to be categorized as Tier II, buildings shall not cast shadows beyond the curb line on the opposite side of the street to the east at 1:30 pm on Winter Solstice (December 21).

In order to meet this requirement, the proposed project would either have to:

- Be placed at least 5’ further from the Kearney St. property line. Which would result in a loss of multiple dwelling units.
- Be a story Shorter (2 stories) at least along the front portion of the building. This would eliminate at least eight dwelling units from the project.
C. GROUND FLOOR CEILING ELEVATION:

The code requires a minimum ground floor elevation ceiling of 14’ to accommodate a “flex” space. This project proposes to set ground floor ceilings at 12’ rather than 14’ for two reasons:

1. The proposed ground floor uses, parking and support areas do not benefit from 14’ high ceilings.
2. 12’ rather than 14’ ceilings help to reduce the shadow impacts and overall massing.

D. PROJECTION ENCROACHMENT:

The code requires a maximum projection/encroachment of 2’ on Neighborhood streets. We believe that an additional 6” benefit the interior space and help create better interior environments.

All the above Tier IV review elements allow for a project that while fitting the context and code intent, provides an important number of much needed dwelling units in the area.

ARCHITECTURAL STYLE:

Though at the start of the project we went through the exercise of designing and modeling a scheme which mimicked the architectural language present in the existing Village at Town Center buildings, neither the Owner nor the Architect saw any benefit to further extending the existing language. Our architectural scheme seeks to interject an urbane, contemporary architectural expression on this site as a counterpoint to the existing building fabric. It was our sense that by differentiating the proposed from the existing, the whole ensemble of buildings is richer, and the contrast allows the passerby to more clearly read the accretive nature of city building. Just as a university campus typically includes buildings of many periods and styles so too a city can benefit from a heterogeneous juxtaposition of architectural form.

Just as, El Cerrito City Hall, a building of real architectural quality and one which helps to establish a sense of place and orientation because its architectural language is distinct from everything around it. The proposed building’s uniqueness within the context will help enrich and identify the area.

The buildings which we’ve proposed are architecturally clear, with a pronounced sense of verticality, harmonious proportions, and a simple palette of earthy and durable materials.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 13, 2018

TO: Elizabeth Dunn, Community Development Department, City of El Cerrito

FROM: Kyle Simpson, Associate/Project Manager
       Theresa Wallace, AICP, Principal

SUBJECT: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Exemption Memo

This memorandum and attachments provide a description of the proposed 10810 San Pablo Avenue, Building E at the Village at Town Center Development Project (project) and substantial evidence to confirm that the potential project is exempt from further environmental analysis per Section 15168(c) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The approximately 1.38-acre project site is located at 10810 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The proposed project would involve demolition of an existing parking area, and construction of a new four-story residential building to include 40 dwelling units, 32 covered parking spaces, interior common areas and amenities and a large open space on the roof level.

Attachment A provides a description of the proposed project. This attachment includes a description of the location, existing site characteristics, the proposed project and required approvals and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the CEQA lead agency for the project.

The responses in an environmental checklist (included in Attachment B to this memorandum) prepared for the project demonstrate for each CEQA topic that because the proposed project was evaluated and impacts were mitigated to the degree possible as part of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP) Project and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), no additional CEQA review is required. CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project was considered within the scope of the evaluation within the SPASP FEIR and no new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

The City can approve the proposed project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its FEIR and no new environmental document for the purposes of CEQA clearance is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10810 San Pablo Avenue, Building E at the Village at Town Center Development Project is exempt from further review under CEQA. This analysis finds that a Notice of Exemption may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.

This page intentionally left blank.
ATTACHMENT B

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following describes the proposed 10810 San Pablo Avenue, Building E at the Village at Town Center Development Project (project), which is located within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP). This section includes a summary description of the project’s location and existing site characteristics, required approvals, and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the lead agency for review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 PROJECT SITE

The following section describes the location and characteristics of the project site and provides a brief overview of the existing land uses within and in the vicinity of the site.

1.1.1 Location

The approximately 1.38-acre (60,060-square-foot) project site is located at 10810 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. Figure 1-1 shows the regional and local context. The site is bounded by Kearney Street to the east, Schmidt Lane to the south, San Pablo Avenue to the west, and the site of a five-story senior housing project to the north currently under construction. The project site is located within a campus setting of four existing residential buildings, identified as Buildings A through D. The existing residential buildings are located along Schmidt Lane and contain a total of 160 residential units. Figure 1-2 depicts an aerial photograph of the project site showing the existing buildings and surrounding land uses. As described below, the project consists of constructing a new building adjacent to Building A along Kearney Street.

Regional vehicular access to the project site is provided by San Pablo Avenue which is State Route 123. In addition, Interstate 80 (I-80) is located to the west of the site. The El Cerrito del Norte Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station is located approximately 0.75 miles north of the site.

1.1.2 Site Characteristics and Current Site Conditions

The project site is generally level and consists of one parcel with Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 503-010-015. The project site is currently developed with covered and uncovered parking spaces for existing residential Building A of The Village at Town Center residential development. Vegetation within the project site consists of planted islands within the parking area and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs around the perimeter of the project site. Existing site conditions are depicted in Figure 1-3.

1.1.3 Existing General Plan and Zoning

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan, and is zoned as TOMIMU as well. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed use development with a 55-foot height limit.
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FIGURE 1-3

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
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1.1.4 San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

In 2014, the City of El Cerrito adopted the SPASP to provide a guide for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that can be applied along its length and to adjacent areas. The SPASP creates a framework for transforming San Pablo Avenue into a multimodal corridor that functions as a place that can provide a multitude of opportunities for living, working and community life. SPASP key principles are to deepen a sense of place and community identity, attract private investment, strengthen partnerships, enhance the public realm, promote the everyday use of transit, walking, and biking, and foster environmental sustainability.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP were evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report\(^1\) (SPASP FEIR). The SPASP FEIR, certified in 2014, evaluates the environmental impacts of approximately:

- 1,706 units of residential development;
- 3,840 new residents; and
- 243,112 square feet of commercial floor area.

The SPASP includes form-based code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and infrastructure analysis. The Complete Streets Plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to attract new users to the area while proactively mitigating the impacts of future population growth on mobility in the SPASP area. The infrastructure analysis identifies the utility providers for San Pablo Avenue, provides a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

1.1.5 Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses. The project is a part of the existing Village at Town Center residential development located on three separate parcels on Schmidt Lane. A senior housing development that is under construction and El Cerrito City Hall are located immediately north of the project site. The office of the El Cerrito Department of Motor Vehicles is located to the east of the project site. Across San Pablo Avenue to the west and across Schmidt Lane to the south of the project site are commercial uses.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

This section provides a description of the proposed project as identified in the materials provided by Trachtenberg Architects (the project applicant) dated February 13, 2018. The project applicant proposes to develop the site with a new four-story residential building to include 40 dwelling units, 32 covered parking spaces, interior common areas and amenities and a large open space on the roof level.

---

1.2.1 Building Program

The project would result in the construction of a four-story residential building with 40 market-rate apartment units and ground-level parking located on the northern portion of the project site. Figure 1-4 and Figure 1-5 depict the overall conceptual site plan and ground floor site plan for the proposed project. The proposed project would be a part of the Village at Town Center residential development which would be comprised of six separate buildings on five different parcels along Schmidt Lane.

As shown in Figure 1-4, the proposed Building E would be comprised of two buildings that would be linked by elevated walkways over the on-site driveway. The proposed project would include 30 one-bedroom apartments and 10 two-bedroom apartments for a total of 40 residential units. The ground level would include 32 one-car parking garages, entry lobby, mail area, bicycle parking, a private Amenity Room for Building A and E residents, and the trash and mechanical and electrical and other utility rooms.

1.2.2 Open Space and Landscaping

The proposed project would include 3,600 square feet of private/common open space that would be provided in the form of an outdoor roof deck on Building E. In addition, the project would enhance an area of 5,400 square feet as private open space within a renovated interior courtyard that currently exists within the project site, as shown on Figure 1-3. Access, Circulation, and Parking

As shown in Figure 1-4, primary automobile access to the site would occur from Kearney Street through a new curb-cut, and would allow access to the single car parking garages and non-commercial surface parking areas.

As shown in Table 1.A, the project would include a total of 59 parking spaces. The proposed Building E would have a total of 32 dedicated parking spaces, one of which is ADA compliant. The existing Building A would have a total of 19 parking spaces, divided between 7 one-car garage spaces, 4 ADA-compliant uncovered parking lot spaces and 8 uncovered parking spaces.

In addition, the existing commercial area located in the existing Building A would have eight parking spaces, consisting of two employee-only garage spaces, five uncovered parking spaces and one ADA-compliant parking space. One covered parking space has been converted to storage.

A total of 60 long-term secured bicycle parking spaces would be located within Building E, and 2 short-term bicycle racks would be located along Kearney Street.
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Conceptual Strip Elevations – San Pablo Avenue and Kearney Street
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Table 1.A: Automobile Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building A (Existing)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A Retail Parking (Existing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.2.4 Utilities and Infrastructure

The project site is located in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including: water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and telecommunications infrastructure. Existing and proposed utility connections are discussed below.

1.2.4.1 Water

Water service in the City of El Cerrito is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The Pardee Reservoir (supplied by the Mokelumne River Basin system) is the main source of water for EBMUD. A 12-inch water line is located along San Pablo Avenue and would serve the project site via a connection.

1.2.4.2 Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via an 18-inch collector main along Potrero Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Potrero Avenue and Schmidt Lane. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, SSD requires payment of a sewer connection charge to the District.

1.2.4.3 Stormwater

The existing asphalt paving and impervious surfaces on the project site account for approximately 55,060 square feet of the 60,060-square-foot project site. Development of the proposed project would reduce the impervious area to approximately 52,560 square feet with the remaining approximately 7,500 square feet dedicated to pervious landscaping surfaces.

The project would incorporate a variety of low impact development measures and media filters, including planted areas, to ensure that stormwater is treated on site.

1.2.4.4 Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity and natural gas services to the site are provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). An existing underground gas line is located along San Pablo Avenue and would serve the project site via a new connection. In addition, an underground electric line is located on San Pablo Avenue and can serve the project.
1.3 APPROVALS/PERMITS

The following approvals and permits would be required for the project:

- City of El Cerrito, grading and building permit approval
- City of El Cerrito, Conditional Use Permit to allow for the new curb cut on Kearney Street
- EBMUD water connection approval
- Stege Sanitary District, per fixture sewer connection charge
- PG&E electricity and gas connection approvals
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Stormwater Control Plan
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), encroachment permit for service connections
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 10810 San Pablo Avenue Development Project (project) is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final EIR (SPASP FEIR)\(^1\) and will have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR and, as such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the 10810 San Pablo Avenue Development Project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its FEIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10810 San Pablo Avenue Development Project does not require any further review under CEQA.

2.1 AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1 Discussion

As described in more detail in the project description (Attachment A – Project Description), the 1.38-acre project site is located within a campus setting that includes four existing residential buildings. The project site is currently developed with existing residential buildings and associated parking spaces as a part of the Village at Town Center development. The proposed project would demolish and remove the existing surface parking spaces and construct a four-story residential building as well as associated parking, open space, and infrastructure connections. The proposed project would include two buildings that would be linked by elevated walkaways over the on-site driveway.

---

As noted in the SPASP FEIR, implementation of the SPASP would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code (FBC) and Complete Streets design and development standards into new projects to support and maintain a strong sense of place and visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are included in Chapter 2, Form Based Code and Chapter 3, Complete Streets of the SPASP.

The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP FEIR was the potential for implementation of the SPASP to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way including roadways and sidewalks, BART station platforms, and areas of lower elevation hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, it was determined that the individual development projects would be subject to further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the SPASP related to visual resources (Mitigation Measure 4-1).

In accordance with Mitigation Measure 4-1 of the SPASP FEIR, it should be noted that the proposed project would include two buildings connected by elevated walkways that would be approximately 45 feet in height which could alter some views of East Bay Hills from the areas west of the project site. The proposed project is located within the SPASP’s Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) zone, which allows building heights of up to 55 feet (65 feet for affordable housing projects). The proposed project would be within the allowable height limit established within the SPASP and would therefore be consistent with the conclusions of the SPASP FEIR. Furthermore, the SPASP FEIR states that Mitigation Measure 4-1 shall be implemented through subsequent permits, conditions, agreements, or other measures consistent with Specific Plan Section 2.02.

The mitigation measure requires preparation of a viewshed analysis to determine if the proposed building meets the standards set forth in the SPASP. However, the El Cerrito Zoning Administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required for the proposed project for the following reasons:

- Due to the orientation of the project site, any potential view impacts would be limited to Kearney Street.
- Due to the relatively low elevation of Kearney Street, the Golden Gate Bridge, Mt. Tamalpais and the San Francisco skyline are not generally visible adjacent to the project site.
- Albany Hill is visible from Kearney Street. However, from the public street, existing buildings block much of the view and only intermittent views of Albany Hill are present along Kearney Street.
- Kearney Street and the properties that face it are at a similar or slightly higher elevation than properties on San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. The grade difference will limit any visual impact of the project from adjacent properties and from Kearney Street.
- The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan limited building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The proposed project would be less than 200 feet in length.
The project is located along Kearney Street, which is identified as a Neighborhood Street in the SPASP. New development on Neighborhood Streets is intended support and maintain the character of existing neighborhoods by respecting existing building types by stepping down the building height, breaking up the building mass and incorporating pedestrian design elements. In accordance with the SPASP, the project would be subject to Tier IV discretionary approval by the Planning Commission and Design Review Board as the project generally complies with the intent of the SPASP, but does not conform to all of the SPASP regulations. The proposed four-story building would cast shadows beyond the curb line of the opposite side of Kearney Street during the winter solstice. However, these new shadows would be minimal and would cover small portions for the DMV parking lot and sidewalks but would not impact any open space or existing residential uses. The ground floor ceiling elevation is 12 feet in height and does not meet the minimum 14-foot requirement. The project frontage does not concisely meet one of the standard permitted types allowed under the SPASP. In addition, the proposed project would result in a projection encroachment above the ground floor of 6 inches over the right-of- way along Kearney Street where 2 feet of encroachment is allowed. These items would be further evaluated as part of Design Review and would not contribute to new environmental impacts not already identified and evaluated in the SPASP FEIR.

The SPASP FEIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of non-reflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

2.1.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 4-2, are required.

2.1.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR; it is within the allowable height limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts related to the proposed project and there is no new impact on visual and aesthetic resources.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled
by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the project site. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. The City of El Cerrito, and the SPASP area, does not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract. In addition, the City does not contain woodland or forestland cover, nor land zoned for timberland production. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to agriculture or forestry resources.


2.3 AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criterion pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Discussion

2.3.1.1 Clean Air Plan Consistency

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and State air quality standards.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines were referenced to determine if the project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan, which for the SPASP FEIR was the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan. The SPASP FEIR found that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would increase at a lower rate under the SPASP than population or service population growth, thus resulting in a less-than-significant impact related to consistency with the applicable clean air plan.

The BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. The 2017 Clean Air Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. To protect public health, the plan describes how the BAAQMD will continue progress toward attaining all State and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities from exposure to air pollution among Bay Area communities. To protect the climate, the plan defines a vision for transitioning the region to a post-carbon economy needed to achieve ambitious greenhouse gas reduction targets for 2030 and 2050, and provides a regional climate protection strategy that will put the Bay Area on a pathway to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets.

The 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP) includes a wide range of control measures designed to decrease emissions of the air pollutants that are most harmful to Bay Area residents, such as particulate matter, ozone, and toxic air contaminants, to reduce emissions of methane and other “super-GHGs” that are potent climate pollutants in the near-term, and to decrease emissions of carbon dioxide by reducing fossil fuel combustion.

The proposed project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The proposed project would develop medium-intensity, transit-oriented residential uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned. In addition, the population and housing units included in the proposed project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as mentioned in Section XIII, Population and Housing. The proposed project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the population growth associated with the proposed project is consistent with the SPASP.

Consistency with the CAP is determined by whether or not the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., excessive parking or preclude extension of transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase population, vehicle trips, or vehicle miles traveled. Additionally, the project would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Therefore the project would support the goals of the CAP and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the plan or designed to bring the region into attainment. This impact would remain less than significant as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

2.3.1.2 Construction-Related Impacts

The SPASP FEIR identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the SPASP would result in short-term emissions from construction activities including site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Development of the proposed project would result in similar construction-related, short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than were evaluated in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation as identified in the SPASP FEIR.
2.3.1.3 Ambient Air Quality Impacts

The SPASP FEIR identified that monitoring data from all ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Bay Area indicate that existing carbon monoxide levels are currently below national and California ambient air quality standards. Monitored carbon monoxide (CO) levels have decreased substantially since 1990 as newer vehicles with greatly improved exhaust emission control systems have replaced older vehicles. The Bay Area has been designated as an attainment area for the CO standards. At the time that the SPASP FEIR was certified, the highest measured levels in San Pablo (the closest monitoring station to the plan area) during the past three years were 1.3 ppm (parts per million) for 8-hour averaging periods, compared with the State and federal criteria of 9.0 ppm.

Even though CO levels in the Bay Area are well below ambient air quality standards, and there have been no exceedances of CO standards in the Bay Area since 1991, elevated levels of CO still warrant analysis. CO hotspots (occurrences of localized high CO concentrations) could still occur near busy congested intersections. Recognizing the relatively low CO concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less-than-significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP, peak hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the SPASP would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes less than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

Development of the proposed project would result in similar construction-related, short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than were evaluated in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

As identified in Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project would result in a similar vehicle trip generation as identified in the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, impacts related to CO hotspots would remain less-than-significant.

2.3.1.4 Short-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Sensitive receptors are defined as residential uses, schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, and medical centers. Individuals particularly vulnerable to diesel particulate matter are children, whose lung tissue is still developing, and the elderly, who may have serious health problems that can be aggravated by exposure to diesel particulate matter. Exposure from diesel exhaust associated with construction activity contributes to both cancer and chronic non-cancer health risks.

According to the BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would: individually expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs) resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million, increased non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or an annual average ambient PM$_{2.5}$ increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu$g/m$^3$). A significant cumulative impact would occur if the project in combination with other projects located within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site would expose sensitive receptors
to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 100.0 in one million, an increased non-cancer risk of greater than 10.0 on the hazard index (chronic), or an ambient PM$_{2.5}$ increase greater than 0.8 µg/m$^3$ on an annual average basis. Impacts from substantial pollutant concentrations are discussed below.

The SPASP FEIR determined that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known TAC. Construction could result in the generation of DPM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading and excavation, paving, and other construction activities. The amount to which the receptors are exposed (a function of concentration and duration of exposure) is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., potential exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards). Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer. The calculation of cancer risk associated with exposure to TACs is typically based on a 70-year period of exposure. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment, however, would be temporary and episodic and would occur over a relatively large area. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-2 would be required to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling.

The closest sensitive receptors include the existing onsite residences, located approximately 30 feet from the proposed multi-family residential buildings. Construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement the best management practices during construction, as required by Mitigation Measure 5-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1, project construction emissions would be below the BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as described above. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

2.3.1.5 Long-Term Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminants

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that would include sensitive receptors. The roadway screening analysis tables from the SPASP FEIR indicate that health risk from high volume surface streets such as San Pablo Avenue, Central Avenue, Carlson Boulevard, and Potrero Avenue would be less-than-significant at average daily traffic volumes (ADT) of 40,000 vehicles or less at a distance of 10 feet. The SPASP FEIR determined that if projects under the SPASP are located within close proximity to surface streets with daily traffic volumes higher than 40,000 ADT, this would represent a potentially significant impact. The project site is located approximately 130 feet from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. Based on the BAAQMD’s Highway Screening Analysis Tool, the proposed project would be exposed to an inhalation cancer risk of 5.169 in 1 million, which is below the threshold of 10 in 1 million. The maximum chronic Hazard Index would be 0.006 and the maximum acute Hazard Index would be 0.013, which would both be below the
BAAQMD significance threshold of 1.0. The tool also indicates that the maximum PM$_{2.5}$ concentration would be 0.064 µg/m$^3$, which is also below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 0.3 µg/m$^3$. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to long term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

2.3.1.6 Odors

The SPASP FEIR identified that the SPASP area would include potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. Most of these major existing sources are however already buffered by existing uses. Responses to odors are subjective, and vary by individual and type of use. Sensitive land uses that include outdoor uses, such as residences and possibly daycare facilities, are likely to be affected most by odors. Consistent with SPASP policies and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-4, the proposed project would be located in an area surrounded by residential and commercial uses and would not be a source of odors or located in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated.

2.3.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-1, are required.

2.3.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and construction activities would be required to comply with SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential air quality impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with air quality.
2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR found that implementation of the SPASP would largely result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the SPASP area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the plan area does not contain any plant or animal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands. The only identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in the plan area is riparian habitat adjacent to Cerrito Creek (near the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center parking lot and Ohlone Greenway) and Baxter Creek. However, the project is not located within the vicinity of either of these resources and therefore would not result in any impacts to these habitats.
The SPASP FEIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the SPASP. Removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season could be considered an "unlawful take" under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. However, the proposed project is located on a developed site and no trees would be removed. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to migratory or nesting birds.

2.4.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.4.3 Conclusion

The proposed project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact on biological resources.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR identified properties or features within the SPASP area that may be eligible for listing in a local, State, or federal register of historic resources (Impact 7-1). However, the project site is currently vacant and was not identified as one of the properties potentially eligible for listing as a historic resource; therefore, Mitigation Measure 7-1 does not apply.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the plan area on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites.
within the SPASP area, and there is a reasonable possibility that archaeological and paleontological resources could be uncovered during these activities (Impacts 7-2 and 7-3). The SPASP FEIR identifies Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3 that would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

LSA conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for the proposed project in October 2017 to identify any previously-recorded cultural resources within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site and to identify any previous-completed cultural resource studies of the project site. The records search, summarized in a memorandum included as Appendix A, identified no recorded cultural resources at the project site and one cultural resource within the 0.25-mile search radius. One previously-recorded cultural resource, P-07-004476, is located approximately two blocks east of the project site and consists of a possible pre-contact Native American archaeological site characterized by midden soil and shell fragments. The cultural resource is not directly adjacent to the project site, and it would not be directly affected by construction or operation of the proposed project.

In addition, there are two previous cultural resource investigations of the project site on file at the NWIC. The previous cultural resource investigations include a portion of the project site and were completed in 2007 for the proposed seismic retrofit of Bay Area Rapid Transit aerial structures and in 2012 for the proposed Ohlone Gardens Housing Project. Neither of the investigations identified cultural resources within the project site.

### 2.5.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, are required.

### 2.5.3 Conclusion

The proposed project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. Ground disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resource impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact on cultural resources.

---


2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the geologic and soil impacts in the plan area are primarily related to potential ground shaking and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the SPASP is not located within an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that the slope instability hazards are also minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is served by a comprehensive, integrated wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. Neither septic tank systems nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the SPASP, including the proposed project.

The Hayward Fault is the nearest active fault to the plan area and is approximately 1.0 mile to the east. The SPASP area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward Fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements.
The SPASP FEIR concluded that grading and construction activities within the SPASP area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques would mitigate potential geological impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would have potentially significant impacts related to earthquake-induced on-site liquefaction, differential settlement, lateral spreading, and subsidence, and associated damage to project buildings and other improvements within the SPASP area. However, potential impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1, which requires preparation and implementation of the recommended measures of a site-specific design-level geotechnical study for individual development projects. A Geotechnical Investigation\(^7\) was prepared for the proposed project, included as Appendix B, and determined that development of the proposed project is suitable on the site and that implementation of recommendations in the report would ensure that impact remain at less-than-significant levels.

### 2.6.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

### 2.6.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code, City-required erosion control techniques, and recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.

### 2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.1 Discussion

As identified in the SPASP FEIR, the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. The BAAQMD suggests applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT per year per capita. Specific plans with emissions above the threshold would be considered to have an impact that, cumulatively, would be significant.

For the SPASP, GHG emissions were computed for two traffic scenarios, Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift, with operational emissions in 2040 using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2. SPASP land use types and size, plus trip generation rates, were input to CalEEMod. CalEEMod predicts emissions of GHGs in the form of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions (CO₂e).

For construction-related GHG emissions, the BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance. The BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction where feasible and applicable, including, but not limited to: using local building materials of at least 10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. The 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) requires a diversion rate of at least 65 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.

The SPASP FEIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the SPASP would have per capita emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e per year under Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, which would not exceed the BAAQMD specific plan-level threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂e/year. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that the SPASP would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the State and local level regarding GHG emissions. The SPASP would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

The proposed project adheres to the building guidelines of the SPASP, is consistent with the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, and promotes reductions in GHG emissions through the development of medium-intensity, transit-oriented residential uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned. The proposed project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and further analysis is not required.

2.7.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.
2.7.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the proposed project there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the SPASP plan area. The SPASP did identify the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during project construction due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the SPASP area. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with all applicable, existing jurisdictional
City-, regional-, and State-mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

According to these requirements, the proposed project would be required to investigate any potential soil or groundwater contamination at the site and comply with existing regulations. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project site on December 11, 2013, and included as Appendix C. The Phase I ESA did not identify any recognized environmental conditions (RECs) at the site but recommended remediating the observed suspect mold or mildew growth at the property with a 10 percent bleach water solution as part of routine maintenance to ensure less-than-significant impacts.

The SPASP FEIR determined that the residential, commercial, and open space uses proposed as part of the SPASP would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the SPASP area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substance such as fuel, pain, and solvents but would be subject to local, State, and Federal regulations. The SPASP determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure potential impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest school to the project site is Fred Korematsu Middle school located 0.7 miles northeast of the project site and Fairmont Elementary School located 0.8 miles southeast of the project site. Since there are no schools within 0.25 miles from the project site, no impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school would occur. The project site is located approximately 30 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. As the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated. No private airstrips are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the SPASP area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

### 2.8.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

---

8 Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. 2013. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report Village at Town Center 6410, 6415-6420, 6530 & 6540 Schmidt Lane and 10810 San Pablo Avenue El Cerrito, California 94530.* December 11.

9 Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. *Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure3-2.* September.

### 2.8.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground disturbing activities. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials at or affecting the proposed project site and there would be no new impact associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

### 2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR determined that long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP could result in contamination of plan area stormwater runoff with petroleum and other contaminants from motor vehicles; however, the compliance with Water Board and jurisdictional City-required post-construction, non-point source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with applicable Water Board, City of El Cerrito, and City of Richmond water quality protection requirements and conditions would ensure any potential construction period and post-construction water quality impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

In addition, construction projects are required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control stormwater peak flows and pollutant levels. This requirement is stipulated in Provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). All projects within the SPASP area must comply with NPDES requirements, including the proposed project. The applicant submitted a Stormwater Control Plan as part of the project application materials. The City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and State requirements as part of the development review process.

The proposed increase in population and traffic associated with the project could increase discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff beyond current levels after partial or full build-out of the SPASP. However, the proposed project would increase the amount of pervious surface on the site from 5,000 square feet to 7,500 square feet. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR identified that portions of the plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the proposed project site is not located within this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. Furthermore, the SPASP area is also not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in the City of Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the proposed project is not located near this area.

2.9.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.9.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to stormwater discharge. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the hydrology and water quality impacts of the proposed project and here would be no new impact associated with hydrology and water quality.
2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that implementation of the SPASP would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use (commercial/housing) development in the plan area at densities and heights greater than currently permitted. Implementation of the SPASP would not result in the division of an established community because the area was primarily developed prior to completion of the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor; facilitating development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, and public transportation centers; and promoting compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development patterns and land uses.

The project site is designated TOMIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP. In addition, the site is also zoned as TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide walkable and bikeable, transit-friendly medium intensity area that allows a wide variety of uses including residential, civic and public uses along with commercial and retails uses around Stockton and Moeser nodes in the plan area. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot high limit (65 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects). The proposed project is generally consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

As previously discussed, the proposed project is subject to Tier IV application review by the Planning Commission. This level of review applies to “innovative, high-quality new projects” that comply with the intent of the SPASP but do not conform to all SPASP regulations. The proposed project would deviate from SPASP development standards related to new shadows, ground floor ceiling elevation, frontage type, and project encroachment above ground floor along Kearney Street. The City’s Planning Commission will consider the proposed project site plan and make findings related to any project design elements that do not specifically conform to SPASP development standards, as contemplated by the form based code guidelines articulated in the SPASP. The proposed project would generally comply with the standards of the TOMIMU designation and would develop the site
with a mix of high density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the SPASP FEIR.

2.10.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.10.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR; therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the land use impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to land use and planning would result.

2.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.
### 2.12 NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.12.1 Discussion

This section compares noise impacts from the proposed project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would include residential and commercial uses in a developed area in the City of El Cerrito. Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would be a result of the proposed project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by the residential and commercial land uses.

A Noise Impact Analysis Memorandum (Noise Memorandum)\(^\text{11}\) was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in this section, and is included in Appendix D. The Noise Memorandum is intended to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1, and examines the impacts of the proposed noise-sensitive uses on the project site together with the project design features and standard conditions. Future noise level impacts are based on the noise measurement data gathered at the project site to account for the impacts associated with the train activity to the east, as well as surrounding traffic and commercial uses.

The primary existing noise sources in the project area are transportation facilities. Traffic on San Pablo Avenue contributes to the ambient noise environment. In addition, train-related activities

associated with the BART tracks, located east of the project site, also contributes to the existing noise environment in the project vicinity. In addition, operational noise from adjacent uses (e.g., nearby construction activities to the north, parking lot noise, and pedestrians) is audible on the project site.

As identified in the Noise Memorandum, to assess existing noise levels, LSA conducted one long-term noise measurement onsite and two BART train pass-by noise measurements offsite, approximately 60 feet west of the BART tracks. The long-term noise measurement recorded a 24-hour measurement from October 3, 2017 to October 4, 2017. The long-term noise measurement indicates that noise levels on the project site are approximately 62.6 dBA Ldn. The BART pass-by measurements ranged from approximately 73.2 dBA to 81.9 dBA Leq.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses, and multi-family residential uses. The project is a part of the existing Villages at Town Center residential development located on three separate parcels on Schmidt Lane. The closest sensitive receptors include the existing onsite residences, located approximately 30 feet from the proposed multi-family residential buildings.

2.12.1.1 Noise and Land Use Compatibility

The SPASP FEIR found that residential land uses facilitated by the SPASP would be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 70 dBA Ldn from traffic and BART noise. Future noise levels would exceed both El Cerrito’s and Richmond’s noise and land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-1, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Noise Memorandum identified the dominant sources of noise in the project vicinity include the nearby construction to the north, traffic on San Pablo Avenue, nearby parking lot noise, and pedestrians. Noise levels on the project site measured approximately 62.6 dBA Ldn, approximately 190 feet east of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. The proposed residences would be located within 130 feet of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue; therefore, adjusted for distance, the proposed residences would be exposed to a noise level of approximately 65.6 dBA Ldn.

The City sets forth normally acceptable noise level standards for land use compatibility and interior noise exposure of new development. The normally acceptable exterior noise level for residential units near BART is 70 dBA Ldn. The normally acceptable interior noise level for residential units is 45 dBA Ldn, and the maximum instantaneous noise level should not exceed 50 dBA in bedrooms and 55 dBA in other rooms. The nearest proposed residential units to the BART rail line are located approximately 270 feet from the BART rail line.
**Interior Noise Analysis.** Based on the EPA’s Protective Noise Levels,\(^{12}\) with a combination of walls, doors, and windows, standard construction for Northern California residential buildings (STC-24 to STC-28) would provide more than 25 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows closed and 15 dBA or more residential interior noise with windows open. With windows open, residents would not meet the City’s normally acceptable standard of 45 dBA Ldn (i.e., 65.6 dBA – 15 dBA = 50.6 dBA). Therefore, an alternate form of ventilation, such as an air-conditioning system, would be required to ensure that alternate form of windows can remain closed for a prolonged period of time for all units at the proposed project. A ventilation system would reduce noise levels for residents with windows closed and would meet the City’s normally acceptable interior noise level criterion of 45 dBA (i.e., 65.6 dBA – 25 dBA = 40.6 dBA).

**Instantaneous Noise Analysis.** The long-term noise measurement indicates a maximum instantaneous noise level of 70.5 dBA Lmax. With windows and doors closed, maximum instantaneous noise levels would be approximately 45.5 dBA Lmax (i.e., 70.5 – 25 = 45.5). This maximum instantaneous noise level would not exceed the City’s instantaneous noise level standards of 50 dBA in bedrooms and 55 dBA in other rooms.

**Exterior Noise Analysis.** In addition, as identified above, exterior noise levels on the project site are approximately 65.6 dBA Ldn. This noise level would be within the City’s acceptable noise level of up to 70 dBA Ldn for residential land uses near BART. Therefore, the project would meet the City’s land use compatibility standards.

### 2.12.1.2 Stationary Source Noise Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would generate minimal onsite stationary noise sources, from HVAC equipment.

The nearest sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project are the existing onsite residences, which are located approximately 30 feet from the proposed multi-family residential buildings.

HVAC equipment is typically the primary noise source associated with residential uses. HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or located within mechanical rooms. The noise sources could take the form of fans, pumps, air compressors, chillers, or cooling towers. HVAC operations would be required to meet all noise standards.

Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location and sizing, are unknown at this time; therefore, for purposes of this analysis, 75 dBA at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related noise.\(^{13}\) The nearest sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project are the existing onsite residences, which are located approximately 30 feet from the proposed multi-family residential buildings. Adjusted for distance to the nearest off-site sensitive receptors, the off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 55 dBA Lmax generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 Lmax during the day and 60 dBA during the night.

---


L_{\text{max}} during the night. Therefore, operations associated with the HVAC equipment would be in compliance with the City’s exterior daytime and nighttime noise standards for residential uses.

In addition, as discussed in many technical noise publications, including the Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement,\textsuperscript{14} the reflection of noise from a barrier or, in this case, a new solid structure such as the proposed project buildings, can be a concern for nearby residences in the project area when a substantial noise source such as the elevated BART tracks exists. As discussed in the Noise Memorandum, at close distances, 1,500 feet and less, the increase in noise due to reflection would be less than 2 dBA. At distances beyond 1,500 feet the calculated level of increase due to reflection would be between 2 and 2.2 dBA. It should be noted that at distances beyond 1,500 to 2,000 feet, noise impacts are much more heavily influence by atmospheric and other conditions, therefore, calculations associated with those impacts should be seen as theoretical, and often conservative in nature. With noise increases of less than 3 dBA, widely considered to be the threshold of perceptibility, the proposed project would not cause significant noise increases to receivers east of the existing train operations.

2.12.1.3 Mobile Source Noise Impacts

Motor vehicles with their distinctive noise characteristics are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. A characteristic of sound is that a doubling of a noise source is required in order to result in a perceptible (3 dBA or greater) increase in the resulting noise level.

The SPASP FEIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the SPASP, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area, and the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases is calculated to be less than 1 dBA L_{dn}. Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial, and the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. The project would generate an estimated 266 daily vehicle trips, with 20 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 25 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.\textsuperscript{15} The adjacent San Pablo Avenue carries approximately 17,640 average daily trips.\textsuperscript{16} Project trips would represent a small fraction of the overall roadway traffic volumes. Therefore, project daily trips would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any roadway segment in the project vicinity, and therefore would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels at receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would remain less than significant.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
2.12.1.4 Construction Noise

The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction. Large pieces of earth-moving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 80 to 85 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods. In addition, pile driving may occur at some of the project sites. This type of construction activity can produce very high noise levels of approximately 105 dBA at 50 feet, which are difficult to control. These noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the noise source and receptor. Intervening structures or terrain would result in lower noise levels.

The SPASP identified that although construction noise would be localized to the individual site location, businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout the plan horizon. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dBA or higher. Such a large increase in noise levels, although short-term in duration, would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, but identified that construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The noise analysis presented in the Noise Memorandum assumed a typical maximum noise level of 86 dBA $L_{max}$ at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases. The Noise Memorandum identified that the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the existing onsite residences, which are located approximately 30 feet from the proposed multi-family residential buildings. Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on these adjacent uses. At 30 feet, there would be an increase of approximately 4 dBA from the increased distance from the active construction area. Therefore, the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 90 dBA $L_{max}$ when construction is occurring at the project site boundary. Construction is permitted by the City when activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sundays and holidays.

The proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would require the implementation of the Municipal Code, the City of El Cerrito General Plan, and Mitigation Measure 13-3, as included in the SPASP FEIR.

2.12.1.5 Construction-Related Vibration

The SPASP FEIR identified that construction projects within the SPASP area may, in some cases, be located directly adjacent to existing structures, including weakened structures. Construction activities may include demolition of existing structures, site preparation work, excavation of below-grade levels, foundation work, pile driving, and new building erection. Demolition for an individual site may last several weeks and at times may produce substantial vibration. Excavation for underground levels would also occur on some project sites and vibratory pile driving could be used to stabilize the walls of the excavated area. Piles or drilled caissons may also be used to support building foundations.
Depending on the proximity of existing structures to each construction site, the structural soundness of the existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, vibration levels may be high enough to damage existing structures. Given the scope of the SPASP and the close proximity of many existing structures, ground-borne vibration impacts would be potentially significant.

As with any type of construction, vibration levels may at times be perceptible. However, construction phases that have the highest potential of producing vibration (pile driving and use of jackhammers and other high power tools) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. By use of administrative controls such as notifying neighbors of scheduled construction activities and scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby businesses, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and would not result in a physical or perceived significant impact.

The SPASP FEIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-4. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, vibratory rollers, and tampers entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the density of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce ground-borne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact was considered to be significant and unavoidable.

Common sources of ground-borne vibration and noise include trains and construction activities such as blasting, pile driving and operating heavy earthmoving equipment. Construction of the proposed project would involve grading, site preparation, and construction activities but would not involve the use of construction equipment that would result in substantial ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise on properties near to the project site. No pile driving, blasting, or significant grading activities are proposed.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The proposed project would require the implementation of the Mitigation Measure 13-4, as included in the SPASP FEIR.

2.12.1.6 Ground Vibration from BART Operations

The SPASP FEIR identified that future development under the SPASP would not expose persons to excessive vibration from BART operations. This impact is considered less than significant.

Along the entire SPASP area, BART operates on an elevated platform. According to data in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, vibration levels resulting from BART would be well below the 72 VdB guidelines for Category 2 land uses near the footprint of the elevated structure. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new or more significant groundborne vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. In addition, implementation of SPASP
policies would reduce potential groundborne vibration impacts on future or existing sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels.

2.12.1.7 Aircraft Noise

The SPASP FEIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the proposed project. The proposed project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Oakland International Airport is the closest airport and is located approximately 19 miles south of the project site. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site; however, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours of any public airport nor does any portion of the project site lie within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources.

2.12.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project would result in an increase in people living close to the BART rail line which could expose sensitive receptors to higher noise levels from BART activity. However, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to noise levels above normally acceptable levels if an alternative method of supplying fresh air (e.g., mechanical ventilation) is required to ensure that windows can remain closed for a prolonged period of time, which would reduce potential operational noise impacts on future sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels. With implementation of this measure, SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1 is satisfied, and no further analysis is required. Implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-3, and 13-4 are also applicable to the proposed project.

2.12.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-3, and 13-4, the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in noise levels. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the noise impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to noise would result.
2.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR evaluated potential environmental impacts that could be associated with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the population growth associated with the SPASP would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the SPASP boundaries. SPASP implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth within a transit-rich, mixed-use plan area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts.

Table 2.A below shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR and also shows existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. As the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.

Table 2.A: Existing and Proposed Housing Units and Population Within the SPASP Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated Within the SPASP FEIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706(^a)</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840(^b)</td>
<td>2,775(^b)</td>
<td>90(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of El Cerrito, Revised Growth Projections November 14, 2017.

\(^a\) El Cerrito, City of, 2014. Final San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

\(^b\) Estimated population associated with approved units, under construction units, and the proposed project was determined by using an average of 2.25 persons per household (3,840 residents / 1,706 units = 2.25 residents per unit).

2.13.2 Applicable Mitigations

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was
certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.13.3 Conclusion

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in the SPASP; therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the population and housing impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts would result.

2.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14.1 Discussion

The SPASP area is located within the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). The SPASP FEIR evaluated the impact that the SPASP’s anticipated 1,706 new residences, and associated increase in expected student population, would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in the District schools over the approximately 25-year horizon of the SPASP implementation. The SPASP FEIR concluded that new students would be accommodated in existing schools, and plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. As the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR (refer to Section XIII, above), the project would also generate students allowed for and analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. As such, existing school facilities could accommodate the proposed project.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the El Cerrito Fire Department and Richmond Fire Department would not need to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand associated with implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, the SPASP FEIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel or equipment resulting from SPASP implementation
would be funded by currently adopted public facility fees levied on the new development (in Richmond) and by the annual budget review and allocation (in El Cerrito). Given this, impacts to fire protection services are anticipated to be less than significant. As the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

As noted in the SPASP FEIR, the increased demand associated with implementation of the SPASP would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The SPASP FEIR also determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in more “eyes-on-the-street” by facilitating a more pedestrian-friendly plan area which would provide a safer public environment. The SPASP identified police department approvals that would be required on a project-by-project basis that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. The City will coordinate with the police department for these approvals. In addition, the proposed project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR and would not result in new impacts associated with police services.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and recreation facilities meets the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP. As discussed in further detail in Section XV, Recreation of this checklist, the SPASP FEIR concludes that the impacts to parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. In addition, the proposed project includes a total of 9,000 square feet of private open space on the project site including 3,600 square feet of private/common open space in the form of an outdoor roof deck and 5,400 square feet of private open space in the form of a renovated interior courtyard for the residents of Building A and proposed Building E of the Village campus. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities.

2.14.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.14.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluates public service impacts and the proposed project’s impacts are included in and analyzed by the SPASP FEIR. Development of the proposed project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project has no new impacts on public services.
2.15 RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and greenways within the SPASP area would meet the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population at full implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, implementation of the SPASP would generate 1,706 new residences and increase the local population by 3,840 people. The increase in residents in the area would increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities, reducing the City’s level of service to 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents (below the 2010 level of 6.67 acres per 1,000 residents) with no increase in acreage of parks or open spaces; however this ratio is above the level of service standard adopted under the City’s General Plan.

As previously noted, the proposed project would include 3,600 square feet of private/common open space in the form of an outdoor roof deck and the enhancement of an 5,400 square feet area of private open space for the residents of Building A and proposed Building E of the Village campus in the form of a renovated interior courtyard. As the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, and the project would conform to SPASP open space standards, the project would result in no new impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities.

2.15.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.15.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including parks and recreations impacts. Development of the proposed project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project has no new impacts on parks and recreation.
### 2.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location which results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.16.1 Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts from the proposed project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was conducted for the proposed project and is referenced in this section. The report includes an analysis to ensure that sufficient traffic operations are maintained with the construction of the proposed project.17

#### 2.16.1.1 Trip Generation

The Traffic Impact Study identified estimated project trip generation for the proposed project based on published trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Publication Trip Generation (9th Edition). Published trip rates for the “Apartment” (ITE Land Use 223) and “Retail” (ITE Land use 820) were used for this project. Table 2.B shows the estimated trip generation for the proposed project, illustrating the existing uses and adding the proposed project to produce the net trips resulting from the expansion. The project is expected to generate approximately 11 weekday AM peak hour trips (9 inbound, 2 outbound) and 16 weekday PM peak hour trips (10 inbound, 6 outbound).

---

Table 2.B: Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (ITE Code)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Daily Rate</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour In</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Out</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Total</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour In</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Out</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (223)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (820)</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>Square Feet (SF)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (223)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (223) *</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (820)</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>Square Feet (SF)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>916</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Proposed Project

2.16.1.2 Site Access and Circulation

Primary automobile access to the site would occur from Kearney Street through a new curb-cut that would allow access to the single car parking garages and non-commercial surface parking areas. An existing curb cut at the northeast corner of the site would be removed. Automobile access would also occur from an existing driveway on San Pablo Avenue to an eight-space parking area dedicated to existing commercial uses located in Building A. The proposed project site plan was reviewed as part of the Traffic Impact Study to evaluate on-site access to the project. Primary automobile access to the site would occur from Kearney Street through a new curb-cut, and would allow access to the single car parking garages and non-commercial covered and uncovered off-street parking spaces. Kearney Street, between Manila Street and Schmidt Lane, is an approximately 650-foot long block. The project site is located on the southern portion of the street, where the existing two-way access is located. The northern half of the street is one way only in the southbound direction from Manila Street to the project site. The southernmost driveway provides access to the residential units for both the existing residential and proposed buildings. The commercial access would be located on the San Pablo Avenue frontage.

The Traffic Impact Study also examined the project site plan in order to evaluate the adequacy of on-site circulation related to queueing, turning radii, and safety and circulation aisles. The proposed circulation aisle would accommodate two-way travel and the turning radii appears to be adequate for passenger vehicles and emergency vehicles. Emergency vehicles would be able to access the project via driveways on Kearney Street and along San Pablo Avenue.

The proposed garbage pickup area would be located near the northeast corner of the site on Kearney Street. Garbage trucks would be able to access the project via Kearney Street, as the trash
bins will be rolled onto the street for pick up. Overall, the proposed on-site vehicle circulation is adequate and would not result in any significant impacts on City streets. Per the below project-specific condition of approval, the project applicant would be required to confirm that trucks can circulate on-site by completing a truck turning analysis for the final site plan.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval:

The project applicant shall complete a truck turning analysis for the proposed driveway for the plans submitted for building permit issuance.

Vehicles exiting the project site through the two driveways have the potential to conflict with pedestrian safety on adjoining sidewalks. Per the below project-specific condition of approval, to ensure safe pedestrian crossings of project driveways, the project applicant would be required to install stop controls at all driveway exits.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval:

The project applicant shall install stop controls at all project driveways to allow for pedestrians to cross the driveway.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific conditions of approval, impacts associated with site access and circulation would be less than significant.

2.16.1.3 Sight Distance Analysis

Sight distance is evaluated to determine if a driver will have adequate visibility to enter a roadway safely without resulting in a conflict with traffic already on the roadway. According to American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Geometric Design of Highway and Streets, 2014, the required minimum stopping sight distance for design speed of 30 mph should be 200 feet on San Pablo Avenue, and for a design speed of 25 mph should be 150 feet on Schmidt Lane and Kearney Street.

The existing driveway on San Pablo Avenue would remain with development of the proposed project, but access to the new residential building would be restricted as part of the project. From this driveway, the visibility looking southbound for northbound traffic would be approximately 250 feet, which is to approximately the San Pablo Avenue/Schmidt Lane intersection. Therefore, the findings included in the TIS indicate that the proposed sight distance and visibility from the San Pablo Avenue driveway would be adequate.

On Kearney Street, the existing driveway on the northern portion of the project site would be removed, and a new southern driveway would be added closer to the existing Building A. Kearney Street is a two way street coming from Schmidt Lane. At the northeast corner of the site, Kearney is a one way roadway, with only southbound movement allowed. The remaining half of the roadway has a posted “Do not Enter”/“Wrong Way” sign with angled parking. There is a red curb with a fire hydrant at the northeast corner of the site. From the new driveway, the visibility looking northbound for southbound traffic is approximately 200 feet, near the northern entrance of the
DMV. The visibility looking southbound is to the end of the street at the Schmidt Lane/Kearney Street intersection. Based on the review and findings of the TIS, the sight distance at the southern driveway would be adequate. However, per the below project-specific condition of approval, the addition of 15 feet of red curb on both ends of the new southern driveway would allow for added visibility from parked vehicles.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval:

The project applicant shall add 15 feet of red curb north and south of the southern driveway on Kearney Street to allow for added visibility from parked vehicles.

The addition of stop controls at all project driveways, as identified above in the project-specific condition of approval, is recommended to allow for enhanced traffic safety and operations at all project driveways. With the incorporation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in any new impacts related to sight distance.

2.16.1.4 Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian access to the proposed Building E would be facilitated by existing sidewalks on San Pablo Avenue and by maintaining the existing mid-block paseo that allows for pedestrian access through the existing Building A between Kearney Street, San Pablo Avenue and Schmidt Lane. A new door has been illustrated at the west elevation on the ground floor of proposed Building E to allow residents to gain access to this building from either San Pablo Avenue or Schmidt Lane without having to use the main lobby on the Kearney Street elevation. A gate has been created at the end of the walkway from the proposed Building E which allows residents to follow a new pathway to gain access to San Pablo Avenue. Crosswalks exist along local roadways in the study area, and existing sidewalks are located along all roadways within the vicinity of the project site where land uses have been developed adjacent to roadways.

A significant impact related to pedestrian access would occur if the proposed project would conflict with applicable or adopted policies, plans or programs related to pedestrian facilities or if it would otherwise decrease the performance or safety of pedestrian facilities. Along Kearney Street, a new curb cut and driveway would replace a portion of the existing sidewalk in order to provide vehicular access to the project site. The removal of an existing curb cut and driveway and addition of the new driveway and the continued maintenance of the streetscape and sidewalk along the San Pablo Avenue, Schmidt Lane, and Kearney Street would not result in any significant impacts to existing or planned pedestrian facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project because pedestrian access would continue to be provided along the project frontage.
As part of the SPASP, San Pablo Avenue is identified as a Community Street and Kearney Street and Schmidt Lane are identified as Neighborhood Streets in the Midtown Area of El Cerrito. The SPASP identifies the possible addition of bulb-outs at all intersections and mid-block crossings and curb ramps at each intersection. The existing streetscape consists of wide sidewalks, landscaping, curb ramps and street amenities that already provide a safe, attractive and walkable environment within the project area.

Also identified in the SPASP is a midblock connection/crosswalk across San Pablo Avenue between Schmidt Lane and Manila Avenue. A midblock connection would provide access for residents and tenants to access the southbound bus stop or any other businesses as San Pablo Avenue develops. A location has not been identified at this time. As mentioned above, the project would maintain the existing mid-block paseo that allows for pedestrian access through the existing Building A between Kearney Street, San Pablo Avenue and Schmidt Lane.

Chapter 2 of the SPASP details the Form-Based Code (FBC) that identifies development standards within the specific plan area. Section 2.01.03 in the FBC summarizes the development standards by street type. Table 2.C details the required FBC standards and the proposed standards as identified in Section 2.01.03 of the SPASP, FBC Summary: Regulation by Street Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>San Pablo Avenue</th>
<th>Schmidt Lane</th>
<th>Kearney Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Street FBC Standard</td>
<td>Project Detail</td>
<td>Neighborhood Street FBC Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6’0” min</td>
<td>4’6”</td>
<td>5’0” min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8’0” min clear pathway</td>
<td>10’10”</td>
<td>5’0” min clear pathway (residential uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0’-0” min.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0’-0” min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: El Cerrito San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, Section 2.01.03, December 2014.

The project does not include sidewalk improvements as this is an existing feature. However, the existing project site provides approximately 10 feet of clear pathway for pedestrians and almost 5 feet of sidewalk amenities with street trees on San Pablo Avenue. Along Schmidt Lane and Kearney Street, there are 5 feet of sidewalk amenities with landscaping and 5 feet of clear pathway for pedestrians. Currently, the condition of the sidewalk and amenities are in good condition and provide a safe and attractive walking environment adjacent to the proposed project area. As a result, the project would not result in any new impacts related to pedestrian access.

2.16.1.5 Transit

A proposed project is considered to have a significant impact on transit if it conflicts with existing or planned transit facilities, or is expected to generate additional transit trips and does not provide adequate facilities for pedestrians and bicyclist to access transit routes and stops. As per the City of El Cerrito Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Existing Conditions Section, Table 3-3: Project Increase in
Walking and Biking, the baseline mode split shows 10 percent of City residents use transit as their primary commute mode. The table also details the SPASP Build Out (2040), and identifies an estimate that 13 percent of El Cerrito residents will use transit. Based on these details and referring to the net trips generated in Table 2.B, the proposed project would generate approximately two transit trips in the AM peak hour and three transit trips in the PM peak hour. Assuming the 2040 buildout, it can be determined that the project would generate three transit trips each in the AM and PM peak hour. The excerpt from the ATP detailing the mode share is included in Appendix E of the Transportation Impact Study.

The nearest transit stop to the project site is located just south of Schmidt Lane. The location of this existing transit stop is not directly in front of the project site and would not require relocation during construction. As a result, construction of the proposed project would not affect current transit service. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are discussed in more detail in Section 2.16.1.7 and support an increase of transit use for the project.

The SPASP identifies enhancing the existing bus stop adjacent to the project area on San Pablo Avenue, just south of Schmidt Lane with a new bus platform. The City of El Cerrito is currently in the process of refining the multimodal improvements identified in the SPASP and developing a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to determine fair share payment by the development projects facilitated by the Specific Plan for these improvements. Per the below project-specific condition of approval, the project applicant is required to contribute the fair share towards the TIF.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:**

The project applicant shall be required to make a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal improvements identified by the SPASP.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific condition of approval, impacts associated with transit would be less than significant.

**2.16.1.6 Parking Requirements**

The City of El Cerrito San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Form Based Code (FBC) summarizes parking and development standards based on district and transect zones. The project location is located in the Midtown District, El Cerrito Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU). The applicable vehicle parking required is shown in Table 2.D.
The project would result in a total of 59 parking spaces, which consists of 46 residential parking spaces, 7 retail commercial spaces, and 6 ADA-compliant parking spaces. In total, there would be 27 fewer parking spaces available with the proposed project compared to the existing parking spaces currently available. Access to residential parking is through the new driveway on Kearney Street, and vehicular access to the commercial spaces would be through the existing driveway on San Pablo Avenue. The City’s FBC parking requirements listed above display a maximum number of required parking spaces. The proposed project assumes 0.96 spaces per residential unit which is within the range of up to 1.5 spaces per unit requirement. Based on the SPASP, the project satisfies the number of parking spaces required and does not exceed the maximum number of spaces. As a result, the project would not result in any new impacts related to vehicle parking.

The project would include a total of 60 long-term bicycle parking and provide short-term outdoor parking on the frontage of Kearney Street, meeting the required bicycle parking spaces for the new Building E. As a result, the project would not result in any new impacts related to bicycle parking.

2.16.1.7 TDM Requirements

This section discusses TDM measures that are applicable to the proposed development. TDM measures encourage walking, bicycling, and public transit use and would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project. The TDM Plan includes measures that are focused on residential tenants of the Village at Town Center Project and estimated Vehicle Trip Reduction (VTR). A summary of the TDM measures are listed in Table 2.E.
### Table 2.E: Summary of TDM Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Elements</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Estimated VTR Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of TDM Information</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will compile and distribute information regarding all TDM measures to residents through provision of a TDM Contact Person and Tenant Welcome Packet</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Continue to support the existing pedestrian network facilities.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Storage</td>
<td>The development includes long-term and short-term bicycle parking on-site</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Bandwidth Internet Connection</td>
<td>The development will provide access to high-bandwidth internet connections for residents to encourage telecommuting</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit EasyPass</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center budgeted $50,000 to provide AC Transit EasyPass to residents</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Commuter Tax Benefits</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will advertise and promote the program to residents</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carpool and Vanpool Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11 Ride Matching Assistance</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will advertise and promote the program to residents</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool/Vanpool Incentives for New Users</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will advertise and promote the program to residents</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Sharing</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will coordinate with a Car Share vendor to provide a car share space on-site for residents, commercial building tenants, and the public to utilize.</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Sharing</td>
<td>The Village at Town Center will coordinate with a Bike Share vendor to provide bike share facilities on-site for residents, commercial building tenants, and the public to utilize.</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Future residents of the project would have opportunities to use alternative transportation modes. These opportunities align with the goals of the SPASP and ATP, and would aid in reducing the total number of single occupant vehicle trips to and from the project site. As a result, the proposed TDM measures fulfill the requirements for the proposed project.

#### 2.16.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, the proposed project would not result in new impacts related to transportation. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the transportation impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to transportation would result.
2.16.3 Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, no new impacts related to transportation would result.

2.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

2.17.1 Discussion

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources of this checklist, Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the proposed project; this mitigation will protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

In addition, subsequent to certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 states that prior to the release of an Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because (a) this Program EIR Checklist supports the findings that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, (b) no new or substantially more severe significant effects could occur under the proposed project, (c) no new mitigation measures would be required, (d) the project is within the scope of the environmental review of the SPASP FEIR, and (e) no further review under CEQA is required, then the City is not required to conduct
formal consultation under AB 52 for this project. However, as stated above, SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project, and will protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

2.17.2 Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures are required.

2.17.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts to tribal cultural resources) of the proposed project and no new impacts would result.

2.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.18.1 Discussion

The SPASP FEIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of build-out of the SPASP – average daily demand would be 882,720 gallons per day (gpd) which represents approximately 0.38 percent of the planning level water demand forecasted in the Urban Water
Management Plan (UWMP). The SPASP FEIR concluded that this represents a small increase and is considered a less-than-significant impact on water supply. The SPASP FEIR also noted that development within the SPASP would incorporate the City’s requirements for providing adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards, application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process, coordination of development review with EBMUD (including consistency with the UWMP), and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigations required as conditions of approval. The SPASP FEIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the SPASP, including the proposed project, would require about 0.38 percent of EBMUD’s forecasted planning level water demand for its service area by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply is considered less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that development associated with the SPASP would result in less-than-significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that the wastewater, and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, in order to accommodate new development facilitated by the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR provided recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements. The construction of the project-related utility infrastructure would be temporary and would occur within existing public rights-of-way, City property, a project development site, or private property subject to a municipal easement.

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via an 18-inch collector main along Potrero Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Potrero Avenue and Schmidt Lane. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, a District-wide per fixture sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge is required to be paid by new development to the District. The connection/capacity charges funds sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated within the SPASP area. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulation. Moreover, the projected solid waste would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient capacities to accommodate development included as part of the SPASP, including the proposed project. As such, solid waste impacts would remain less than significant.

2.18.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project is consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the proposed project would not result in new impacts related to utilities and service systems. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately
evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the proposed project and no new impacts related to transportation would result.

2.18.3 Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.
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STREET ELEVATION

1. KEARNEY STREET STRIP ELEVATION

2. SAN PABLO AVE. STRIP ELEVATION
KEY NOTES

1. 30/30 STUCCO W/ PTD FINISH TO MATCH EXISTING STUCCO ON BDG. B
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LONG TERM BICYCLE PARKING AND TRASH ROOM

### BIKE PARKING SPECS

**STRETCH RACK**

The stretch rack provides the most dense bike parking solution. The rack can be flexible in size, to fit within the site constraints. Available in locking and non-locking options, the stretch rack is a versatile, modular indoor solution for long term parking needs.

**Product Details**

- Modular construction allows for easy expansion, side by side or bank together.
- Stepped bicycle parking saves space and ensures cleanliness.
- Can be combined with vertical racks for full bike room setup.
- Does not require anchoring (wall or floor).
- Bolt together design.

**Specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike Spacing</th>
<th>1/4&quot; 20'-5&quot;</th>
<th>1/4&quot; 18'-2&quot;</th>
<th>1/4&quot; 5'-4 1/4&quot;</th>
<th>1/4&quot; 23'-6&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Bikes</td>
<td>4.5 ft</td>
<td>4.5 ft</td>
<td>1.6 ft</td>
<td>7.0 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Bikes</td>
<td>4.0 ft</td>
<td>3.8 ft</td>
<td>1.5 ft</td>
<td>6.5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Bikes</td>
<td>3.5 ft</td>
<td>3.4 ft</td>
<td>1.4 ft</td>
<td>6.0 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Bikes</td>
<td>3.0 ft</td>
<td>2.9 ft</td>
<td>1.3 ft</td>
<td>5.5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Bikes</td>
<td>2.5 ft</td>
<td>2.4 ft</td>
<td>1.2 ft</td>
<td>5.0 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Spacing**

Stretch Racks are manufactured in various sizes. Please contact SARIS for more information.

Add 6" metal door for mailroom and 36" metal door for row. 1/2" opening clearance required.

1. Modular construction allows for easy expansion, side by side or bank together.
2. Stepped bicycle parking saves space and ensures cleanliness.
3. Can be combined with vertical racks for full bike room setup.
4. Does not require anchoring (wall or floor).
5. Bolt together design.

**Trash Room**

- 2 YD. BIN - ROLLABLE
- 64 GAL. (TYP)

**Future Compost Bins**

R.O.W.
LANDSCAPE CALCS

2,207 SF  EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREA
5,889 SF  NEW LANDSCAPE AREA
8,112 SF  TOTAL LANDSCAPE AREA

LEGEND

SYM  DESCRIPTION

EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN
NEW TREE
EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREA
NEW LANDSCAPE AREA
NEW PAVERS
NEW CONCRETE
NEW DG

VILLAGE AT TOWN CENTER
1000 SAN PABLO
EL CERRITO, CA

LANDSCAPE PLAN

L1.0
# Plant Schedule - Ground Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Height x Width</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCP</td>
<td>LOBOSMORON CONVERTA</td>
<td>BRISBANE BOX</td>
<td>EVERGREEN TREE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>20&quot; x 25&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG NAT</td>
<td>LAGESTROEMIA NATCHEZ</td>
<td>CREPE MYRTLE</td>
<td>DECIDUOUS TREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>25&quot; x 25&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH JAP</td>
<td>OPHIOPOGON JAPANICA</td>
<td>MONDO GRASS</td>
<td>GRASS-LIKE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4&quot; POT</td>
<td>10&quot; x 1.5&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA TAJ</td>
<td>DIANTHUS PERSICAFRICA VARIETAS</td>
<td>VARIGATED LILY</td>
<td>GRASS-LIKE</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>2&quot; x 2&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLE GIB</td>
<td>BLECHNAMIA GBIBUM SILVER LADY</td>
<td>DWARF tree fern</td>
<td>FERN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA BLU</td>
<td>AGAVE BLUE GLOW</td>
<td>BLUSH GOM IRON AGE</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM MAI</td>
<td>DYMOSOON MARGARETAE A.</td>
<td>PYGMY LILY</td>
<td>GROUND COVER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1&quot; POT</td>
<td>1.5&quot; x 1.5&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOM BRE</td>
<td>LEANDERIA LIME TUFF</td>
<td>DWARF LIME TUFF</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL LIT</td>
<td>CALLISTEMON LITTLE LIZA</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN SER</td>
<td>SENECEO SERPEPS</td>
<td>BLUSH GOM IRON AGE</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAI EBI</td>
<td>ANANGIOLEA C.W.</td>
<td>BUSH IRON AGE</td>
<td>HUMID</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA FIA</td>
<td>AGAVE BLADE</td>
<td>BLUSH GOM IRON AGE</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA COG</td>
<td>AGAVE TIC NICE TIC</td>
<td>DWARF BUSH WATTLE</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS ECI</td>
<td>RUSSLANDIOLA OCHRENSIS</td>
<td>TIDAL PLANT</td>
<td>GRASS-LIKE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# Plant Schedule - Bioretention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Height x Width</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUN PAT</td>
<td>JUNCUS PATINS</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA GREY FUSH</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEY CON</td>
<td>LEYMEUS CONGENSATIS &quot;CANYON PRINCE&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;CANYON PRINCE&quot;</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# Plant Schedule - Roof Deck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Height x Width</th>
<th>Water Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAG GOL</td>
<td>BAMBOO &quot;GOLDEN GODDESS&quot;</td>
<td>GOLDEN GODDESS BAMBUE BANDIC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT MAX</td>
<td>PITOSPORUM &quot;MARDIERE CHAMPAIGN&quot;</td>
<td>VARIEGATED KO KUBO</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>1.5&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA KAR</td>
<td>AGAVE KARA &quot;STRIPE&quot;</td>
<td>VARIEGATED AGAVE</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO STT</td>
<td>ALOE &quot;LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD&quot;</td>
<td>DWARF ALOE</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS ECI</td>
<td>RUSSLANDIOLA OCHRENSIS</td>
<td>TIDAL PLANT</td>
<td>GRASS-LIKE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH COG</td>
<td>ACACIA COGNATIS &quot;COUSIN ITT&quot;</td>
<td>DWARF RIVER WATTLE</td>
<td>SHRUB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>3&quot; x 3&quot;</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEB LEP</td>
<td>SEED LEAF</td>
<td>SEDUM LEMON SAIL</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4&quot; POT</td>
<td>1 X 1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEB STE</td>
<td>SEED STRING OF BANANAS</td>
<td>TRAILING SEED</td>
<td>SUCCULENT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4&quot; POT</td>
<td>1 X 1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **BRISBANE BOX**
- **CREPE MYRTLE NATCHEZ**
- **DIANELLA VARIEGATA**
- **BLETCHNAMIA GBIBUM SILVER LADY**
- **AGAVE BLUE GLOW**
- **AGAVE BLUE FLAME**
- **ACACIA COGNATIS "COUSIN ITT"**
- **SEED STRING OF BANANAS**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **BRISBANE BOX**
- **CREPE MYRTLE NATCHEZ**
- **DIANELLA VARIEGATA**
- **BLETCHNAMIA GBIBUM SILVER LADY**
- **AGAVE BLUE GLOW**
- **AGAVE BLUE FLAME**
- **ACACIA COGNATIS "COUSIN ITT"**
- **SEED STRING OF BANANAS**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **SEED LEAF**
- **SEED LEAF**
## WATER BUDGET CALCULATIONS

### PART 1: SUMMARY MPD-LIR WATER ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET Adjustment Factor</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Irrigated Area (A)</td>
<td>5,880 sqm (631 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Area (B)</td>
<td>4 sqm (0.04 ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*WATER = E x A x K = 0.6 x 5,880 = 3,528 gal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAB SCAPING WATER ALLOWS: 4,541 gal (297%)

### PART 2: ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE FROM MPD LIR TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Irrigated Water Use Rate (gal/ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turf</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3,557 gal/ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Turf</strong></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2,904 gal/ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawn</strong></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1,948 gal/ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Landscape Area</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,380 gal/ft²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Designated Area</th>
<th>Total E</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turf</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Turf</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Area</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE: 13,920 gal (932%)

## IRRIGATION NOTES AND CALCULATIONS

1. A combination of SUBSURFACE - DRIP AND BUBBLERS will be installed in all landscapes areas.
2. Irrigation system shall be equipped with an irrigation controller capable of dual programming and have a rain sensor.
3. Plants will be grouped into hydrozones and will be irrigated separately from those with different water requirements.
4. Irrigation will operate between 4 hours of 0AM and 10AM
EXISTING LANDSCAPE TO REMAIN

EXISTING 16 STATION/RADIR IRRIGATION CONTROLLER, REPLACE WITH NEW CONTROLLER. REFER TO LEGEND FOR MODEL NUMBER. CONNECT TO EXISTING ELECTRICAL SERVICE AT THIS LOCATION.

EXISTING WATER METER AND EXISTING BACKFLOW PREVENTER, SITE VERIFY EXACT LOCATION.

IRRIGATION DEMAND: 5 GPM AT 55 PSI. FIELD VERIFY STATIC WATER PRESSURE PRIOR TO STARTING ANY WORK. IF PRESSURE VARIES FROM REQUIRED PRESSURE STATED ABOVE, NOTIFY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS.

SEE SHEET L3.2 FOR ROOF DECK IRRIGATION PLAN
SEE SHEET L3.3 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND NOTES
SEE SHEET L3.4 & L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS
SEE SHEET L3.6 FOR IRRIGATION CALCULATIONS

SCALE: 0" = 1'-0"
NOTE: REMOTE CONTROL VALVES ON THE ROOF DECK MUST BE WALL MOUNTED AS DIRECTED BY ARCHITECT.

1" COPPER STUB-OUT FOR IRRIGATION FROM GROUND LEVEL TO BE SUPPLIED, ROUTED, AND INSTALLED BY PLUMBING CONTRACTOR.

1" ELECTRICAL CONDUIT FROM CONTROLLER AT GROUND LEVEL TO REMOTE VALVES, VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS, ROUTING, AND INSTALLED BY ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR.

SEE SHEET L3.3 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND NOTES
SEE SHEET L3.4 & L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS
SEE SHEET L3.6 FOR IRRIGATION CALCULATIONS

NOTE: REMOTE CONTROL VALVES ON THE ROOF DECK MUST BE WALL MOUNTED AS DIRECTED BY ARCHITECT.

1" COPPER STUB-OUT FOR IRRIGATION FROM GROUND LEVEL TO BE SUPPLIED, ROUTED, AND INSTALLED BY PLUMBING CONTRACTOR.

1" ELECTRICAL CONDUIT FROM CONTROLLER AT GROUND LEVEL TO REMOTE VALVES, VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS, ROUTING, AND INSTALLED BY ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR.

SEE SHEET L3.3 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND AND NOTES
SEE SHEET L3.4 & L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS
SEE SHEET L3.6 FOR IRRIGATION CALCULATIONS
DRIP IRRIGATION NOTES

1. PLANS ARE DIAGRAMATIC. INSTALL DRIPING AND OPTIONS FOR MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS AND INSTALLATION DETAILS.

2. INSTALL DRIPING MAXIMUM OF 15' APART WITH EMISSORS TANGENT TO SPACES. INSTALL F FROM CENTER OF PLANTED MATERIALS IN EACH PLANTED AREA. GROUND WIRE SHALL BE INSTALLED AT A CONSISTENT DEPTH THROUGHOUT THE CIRCUIT.

3. PLACE ARROWHEAD/RELIEF VALVES AT THE HIGHEST POINTS OF EACH ZONE AND JUST BELOW CHECK VALVES ON SLIDES. INSTALL ONE ARROWHEAD RELIEF VALVE FOR EVERY 1125' OF TOTAL DRIPING PER ZONE.

4. PLACE Flush VALVES AT THE HYDRAULIC CENTER OF THE EXHAUST HEADER OR AT LOW POINT ON SLIDES.

5. INSTALL IN ONE CHECK VALVES ON SLIDES GREATER THAN 3 IN VERTICAL OR LESS. PLACE DRAINAGE COLLECTORS DOWNSTREAM FROM THE DRAINAGE COLLECTOR AT THE ZONE PERIPHERY OR AT THE ZONE EDGE. PLACE DRAINAGE COLLECTORS AT THE ZONE PERIPHERY OR AT THE ZONE EDGE.

6. ON ALL SLIDES AND MOUNTS. PLACE THE DRAINAGE LATERALS ACCORDING TO THE SLIDE CONFIGURATION WHERE TO PROTECT THE DRAINAGE LATERALS FROM EXCESSIVE DRIPING.

7. PVC SUPPLY AND DRAINING LINES SIZE FOR SLAVES SUPPLY AND DRAIN LINES SHALL BE THE SAME SIZE FOR THE ENTIRE ZONE:
  • 0-4 GPM – 3/4" DRAINAGE LINES
  • 5-12 GPM – 1 1/4"

8. FITTINGS SHALL BE THE SAME MANUFACTURER AS DRIPING SYSTEM

9. INSTALL DRAIN LATERALS TO GROUND AT DRAINAGE COLLECTORS. USE ADDITIONAL SPACES OVER-LIGHTING BOARD OR CROSS. USE U-SHAPED SPACES OVER MOUNTING BOARD TO FRINGE VANDERING THE DRAINAGE.

10. THOROUGHLY Flush EACH INSTALLATION SEGMENT TO ENSURE NO DEBBS OR CONTAMINATION OCCURS.

11. STAY IN THE DRIPING SYSTEM EVERY DAY EVERY OTHER DAY TO ENSURE ESTABLISH PLANT MATERIAL, MAINTAIN A CONSISTENT MOISTURE BALANCE IN THE SOIL IS IMPORTANT TOWARD THE SOIL MOST WITHOUT SATURATION.
**VILLAGE AT TOWN CENTER**

**WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET**

Reference Evapotranspiration (Eto)  46.29

### PART ONE  MAXIMUM APPLIED WATER ALLOWANCE (GAL/HR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART</th>
<th>MAXIMUM WATER ALLOWANCE (GAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46.29 GAL/HR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART TWO  ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE (GAL/HR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART</th>
<th>ESTIMATED WATER USE (GAL/HR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5.41 GAL/HR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HYDROZONE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>% of Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Lawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (P1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High View (P2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Yard (P3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Water Use Plants (P4)</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Area (SRA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,214</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IRRIGATION WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>HIYER</th>
<th>PLANT</th>
<th>HYDROZONE</th>
<th>PLANT</th>
<th>HYDROZONE</th>
<th>IRRIGATION METHOD</th>
<th>IRRIGATION AREA</th>
<th>ETPA</th>
<th>HYDROZONE AREA</th>
<th>ETPA x HYDROZONE AREA</th>
<th>ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED TOTAL WATER USE %</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 ACRE FT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HYDROZONE DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Lawn</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (P1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High View (P2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Yard (P3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Water Use Plants (P4)</td>
<td>4,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Area (SRA)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HYDROZONE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROZONE</th>
<th>PLANT</th>
<th>HYDROZONE FACTOR</th>
<th>PLANT FACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IRRIGATION METHOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Lawn (P1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High View (P2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Yard (P3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Water Use Plants (P4)</td>
<td>4,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Landscape Area (SRA)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ET PA (ET PA) PARAMETERS

- **Annual ET PA (ET PA)**: 46.29
- **ET PA for Regular Landscape Areas**: 0.41
- **ET PA for Special Landscape Areas**: 46.29
- **ET PA for All Landscape Areas**: 5.41

### LANDSCAPE AREA

- **Total Landscape Area**: 5,214 SQ FT
- **Percentage of Landscape**: 100.0%

### WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

- **Reference Evapotranspiration (Eto)**: 46.29

### IRRIGATION WORKSHEET

- **Irrigation Method**: Various
- **Hydrozone Description**: Various
- **Hydrozone Factors**: Various
- **Estimate Water Use**: Various

### SCHEDULE

- **Sheet Date**: 10-31-16
- **Revision**: L3.6

---

**Note**: All calculations and data are for illustrative purposes only.

**Source**: Garden Architecture

**Contact**: Robert Trachtenberg | Lic.# 713583
931 Pardee Street | Berkeley, CA 94710
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DESIGN REVIEW Tier II Staff Report  
April 4, 2018  
10963 San Pablo Avenue

DETAILS

**Application Number:** PL17-0084  
**Applicant:** Brian Williams, Studio KDA  
**Location:** 10963 San Pablo Avenue  
**APN:** 509-110-015, and 017  
**Zoning:** Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)  
**General Plan:** Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)  
**Request:** Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 5-story building containing 50 residential units, and @3,000 of commercial square feet.

**CEQA:** This project has been found to be consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report prepared for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15182.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlement for Design Review Board review consists of a Tier II Design Review project, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board. This review includes authority over the following elements only:
- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

The project proposes a new 5-story building containing 50 residential units, and @3,000 of commercial square feet. Thirty-four (34) on-site parking spaces are proposed.

The building features a mixture of traditional and contemporary design elements. The ground floor entry for the commercial space is proposed along San Pablo Avenue. The main residential lobby access is from Jefferson Avenue. This entry integrates public art and is immediately abutting a public open space. The San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson elevations share similar design elements. Both ground floor elevations are to be clad in white and gray ceramic tile and board formed concrete. The upper floors of the both elevations are to be a combination of wood siding, and cement plaster, and standing seam metal on the Jefferson Avenue elevation. The railings are to be of wood, metal and a polycarbonate panel. Black anodized aluminum windows are proposed throughout the project. The landscape design features several native, drought-tolerant species.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located within the San Pablo Avenue corridor that is predominantly developed with commercial, retail uses and multi-family residential uses.

The project site is approximately 0.43 acre (18,259-square-foot lot) and is located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue, on the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The project site is generally level and consists of two parcels between the City of El Cerrito (APN 509-110-015-5), and the City of Richmond (APN 509-110-017-1). Together, these two parcels comprise a .49 acre site. The El Cerrito parcel is on the eastern portion of the site and is an approximately 0.35-acre parallelogram shaped parcel of land with an approximately 9,360-square-foot one-story commercial building and associated paved and landscaped areas. The Richmond portion of the site is 3,092 square feet and approximately 0.070 acre bordering Jefferson Avenue to the west, and is used primarily for parking.

Pursuant to Section 2.03.02.04, parcels which lie across jurisdictional boundaries shall be subject to the entitlement process of the jurisdiction in which it has the most land acreage. The other jurisdiction will remain a responsible agency and projects may be subject to additional design review. In this case, the staff of El Cerrito and Richmond have worked collaboratively in the review of the project and comments have been integrated into the current proposal. See Unique Considerations Section.

Vicinity Map

The project site’s bordering streets are Jefferson Avenue to the north, and San Pablo Avenue to the east. There is a “no build” easement on the southern edge of the property limits that is approximately 140 feet long and 10 feet wide.

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan, and is zoned as TOMIMU in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan as well. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed use development with a 55-foot height limit.
Regional vehicular access to the project site is provided by Interstate 80 (I 80) located to the west of the site; the El Cerrito del Norte BART Station is located 0.7 mile south of the site. AC Transit bus service is located within 0.25 mile of the project site.

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The overall site is bounded by two streets: San Pablo Avenue, and Jefferson Avenue. Vehicular access is proposed from a new off-street garage on Jefferson Avenue. The Jefferson Avenue frontage is 175 feet in length, and the frontage along San Pablo Avenue is 101 feet in length. San Pablo Avenue features an existing AC Transit bus stop (Lines 72 and 72M).

Existing/Previous Land Use

The existing one-story commercial building is currently occupied by three businesses, including a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade/museum. The site is generally flat and slopes west to east and south to north. There is approximately 7,000 square feet of asphalt and concrete utilized as a parking lot, which is accessible from a driveway along Jefferson Avenue. A total of 20 striped parking spaces are currently on the site. A concrete access ramp is located on the south side of the building, and a wooden access ramp is located on the building’s west side. Approximately 1,700 square feet of landscaped area is primarily on the site’s western perimeter of the building. The sparse vegetation on the site consists of street trees lining the sidewalks and patches of grass and shrubs around the perimeter and throughout the site.

Site Photo
Adjacent Land Uses

North: A four-story, 64 unit senior assisted living facility.

East: An apartment complex, consisting of six three-story buildings, with related covered parking; to the south of this site is land owned by the City of El Cerrito, and the future temporary location of the El Cerrito Senior Center.

South: A mixed use development with ground floor commercial uses, and 22 apartment units.

West: A six-unit multi-family apartment building (within the City of Richmond).

Analysis

Project Description

The proposed project is to construct a new five-story building, consisting of approximately 3,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, a 34 space off-street parking garage, and 50 residential units consisting of 4 studio, 20 one-bedroom, 20 two-bedroom, and 6 three bedroom units. The proposed building includes ground floor bicycle storage, an outdoor rear yard area of approximately 2,000 square feet, a roof deck of approximately 748 square feet at the western side of the proposed building, as well as four separate amenity areas on the second through fifth floors. All of these spaces are proposed to be 453 square feet in size and include a gym on the second floor, a yoga room on the third floor, and a shared office space on the fourth and fifth floors. Each of these spaces contains a full bath. There are two stairways, and one elevator to serve the residents of this building.

Unique Considerations

This project is unique in that the site is bisected by the boundary line between the cities of El Cerrito, and Richmond. Language in Section 2.03.02.04, Parcels in both Jurisdictions, of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, establishes an entitlement process for the jurisdiction in which has the most land acreage when parcels lie across jurisdictional boundaries. The other jurisdiction remains a responsible agency, and projects may be subject to additional design review. As this is the situation with this proposal, the City of El Cerrito is the jurisdiction with regulatory control, and has been coordinating with the City of Richmond regarding this proposal. Attachment 3 is the comment letter from the Design Review Chair of the City of Richmond.

A condition of approval has been prepared that requires the project applicant to submit an application for a Lot Merger (LM) to combine these two parcels prior to the issuance of a building permit from the City of El Cerrito. The Lot Merger combines these two parcels so a building permit can be issued, and does not affect the existing jurisdictional boundaries between the cities of El Cerrito and Richmond.

Vehicular Parking

If the proposed building is approved, 50 new dwelling units will be created. Thirty-four (34) on-site parking spaces are proposed, which results in a parking ratio of 0.68. The Transit Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) district requires additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures when the proposed parking ratio is between 0-1. The applicant prepared a TDM Plan with is included in Attachment 7. The Plan requires additional TDM measures consisting of: 1) subsidizing the purchase of Clipper Cards for each residential unit of the proposed building for one year. The subsidy is to be $3.00
per day per residential unit; and 2) designating the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) creating TDM marketing materials and providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling. The conclusion of the TDM Plans states, “It is estimated that with the implementation of the strategies described above, the peak parking demand generated by Project residents would be reduced to between 31 and 46 parking spaces. Considering the 34 on-site parking spaces, it is estimated that Project would result in between a parking deficit of 12 spaces and a surplus of three spaces after implementation of the required and additional parking demand reduction strategies.”

Public and Private Open Space

A new public plaza, of 1,427 square feet, is proposed along Jefferson Avenue. This area consists of an informal seating area (that is adjacent to and outside of a commercial space) which can be used by patrons of this space or the public; a separate seating area that is part of an exterior landscape area; a bocce court, and a par course/exercise area. There is a shortage of 141.87 square feet of public open space which will be paid with an in-lieu fee for the required square footage of public open space.

There are private balconies for most of the residential units, a ground floor rear yard, and a fourth floor deck for private open space areas. These areas establish 5,588 square feet of private open space, which exceeds the requirement of 4,000 square feet required of the project (80 square feet per unit).

Compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan

Chapter Two of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan establishes the land use regulations and development standards of the Specific Plan Area.

Some development standards apply throughout the Plan area. These include:
- Regulation by Street Type – which includes building placement, building form, and shadow analysis.
- Open Space Requirements – which includes private, common and public open spaces.

Other development standards vary by transect zone. The development standards that are related to the transect zone include:
- Use-Types of land use permitted, conditionally permitted or prohibited.
- Building Height- the minimums and maximums heights allowed.
- Parking of vehicles – the minimum and maximum number of spaces allowed.
- Parking of bicycles- the minimum number of spaces allowed.

This project is located in the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOMIMU) Transect and meets all of the relevant development standards specified for its location in the Plan Area.

The tables below show the relevant Specific Plan standards and the compliance of the project with those standards. The project is located on the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. This section of San Pablo Avenue is designated a Community Street. Jefferson Avenue is a Neighborhood Street.
### Regulation by Street Type:

#### SPA Community Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: Up to 10 ft. for non-residential uses; up to 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
<td>5 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>55 ft. (Meets shadow standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Street facing ground floor units and spaces to have individual entries along front or side streets. Upper floor units and spaces to be accessed along the front or side streets.</td>
<td>2 entries to commercial spaces; 1 building access through a pathway and fence along the southern elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways, minimum 100 feet apart. Side access on corner lots.</td>
<td>(1) 20 ft. driveway on Jefferson Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Setbacks</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
<td>14 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
<td>9 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Length</td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
<td>101’ ft. along street frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Transparency</td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min</td>
<td>80% for Shop Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Transparency</td>
<td>30% min</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Encroachments</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Encroachments</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed Frontage Types</td>
<td>Min: 50% Flex</td>
<td>Shop Front (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 50% Forecourt (NE side). Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade (NE side SPA) or Ecofront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Placement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>5 ft. min</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min adjacent to commercial uses, 5 ft. min adjacent to residential uses</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Activity Zone</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>4 ft., 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Front Setback</td>
<td>Min: distance needed to accommodate required zones Max: 10 ft. for non-residential uses, 15 ft. for residential uses</td>
<td>12 ft. 2in. for residential use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Entries on front or side streets</td>
<td>Two (2) new building entries on Jefferson Avenue (one main lobby, one stairway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways. Side access on corner lots</td>
<td>One new curb cut that is 20 ft. wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Form</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Setbacks</td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</td>
<td>9 ft. min clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Length</td>
<td>200 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Transparency</td>
<td>Non-residential 50% min, Residential 30% min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Floor Transparency</td>
<td>25% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Encroachments</td>
<td>2 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Encroachments</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed Frontage Types</td>
<td>Front Yard, Forecourt (NE side), Flex (commercial), Shop Front (commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: For the purposes of administering the development standards detailed above, the Zoning Administrator has determined that San Pablo Avenue is the front of the project site, and in the event of a conflict, the Community standards prevail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min 50x80=4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5,588 provided. Overall surplus for the project of 1,588 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Open Space</strong></td>
<td>25 sq. ft./1,000 sq. ft. of building for buildings &gt;25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 1,613.87 sq. ft. required)</td>
<td>1,472 sq. ft. of public open space provided; an in-lieu fee of $14,470.74 will be provided to the City for the public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Zone</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Up to 1.5 spaces/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
<td>0.68 space per unit (total of 34 new garage spaces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>Min 1 short-term space/20 units 50/20=2.5 (3) Residential 2,989 sq. ft. = 2 short term Commercial Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit 1.5x50=75</td>
<td>6 short-term spaces Surplus 2 spaces 76 long-term spaces Surplus 1 space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Height</strong></td>
<td>55 ft. max</td>
<td>55 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Height</strong></td>
<td>3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial</td>
<td>5 residential stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

The project addresses San Pablo Avenue with entries onto the street and improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will enhance San Pablo Avenue, as a place, in conformance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

The project will provide 50 new housing units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will face San Pablo Avenue, providing a pleasant pedestrian environment along the street.
**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project utilizes an under-utilized site that contains a one-story commercial building that is currently occupied by three businesses, including a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade/museum. There is 7,000 square feet that is a surface parking lot with 20 parking spaces. The proposed project will provide 50 new housing units in close proximity to public transit.

**Strategy C.3:** Allow ground floor residential development to provide flexibility and expand the Specific Plan Area’s residential base.

The project proposes ground floor commercial space and will contribute to the range of small neighborhood retail or eating establishments. The balance of the project expands the residential base within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 50 new housing units in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**Design Review Process**

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.B of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, Tier II Design Review is the entitlement process for new projects that have been designed in full-compliance with the design standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

The Design Review Board is the body of decision for Tier II Design Review. The discretionary scope of Tier II Design Review includes the following components:

- Exterior building colors, materials, and textures
- Landscaping
- Site Plan
- Building facades and articulation
- Relationship of the development to adjacent public rights-of-way
- Signs
- Locations and footprints of bioretention facilities as required for stormwater management

**Architectural Design**

The building’s architecture incorporates a strong contemporary aesthetic. The building will feature a traditional-looking ground floor and street presence. The upper floors feature balconies that express a more contemporary aesthetic. The materials for the balconies on the north, west, and east elevations are varied — using either a true cedar/redwood or a similar wood material, an exterior grade polycarbonate semi-translucent panel in lime green or metal railings (on the southern elevation) to create visual interest for the balconies. There are also a variety of colored Hardie panels which area used vertically on the San Pablo and Jefferson Avenue frontages to add interest to the building. The other materials of the building will be two different grey colors of the cement plaster, and vertically installed grey standing metal seam panels. The southern elevation also uses a bright blue colored cement plaster and standing seam metal panel to accentuate this elevation. The same bright blue colored cement plaster will be installed as the background color for the exterior stairway on the Jefferson Avenue elevation. The project features a flat roof. The ground floor would be clad in an exterior grade ceramic tile that is to be white and grey. Board formed concrete will also be used on the ground floor. The
The project proposes to use black anodized aluminum windows for the ground floor commercial spaces, and black vinyl windows (VPI Quality Windows) for the residential units. The building integrates differing window shapes and sizes at appropriate locations, to create a consistent architectural language.

Project Renderings

West Elevation

[Image of building rendering]

[Image of building front view]
Landscape Design

Seven street trees exist along the San Pablo and Jefferson Avenue elevations. Four of these trees – three Chinese Hackberry and one Sweet Gum – are to be removed as part of the project. Additionally, two smaller Ornamental Pear trees along Jefferson Avenue are to be removed as they interfere with the site work that is required for the project. Eight new 24” box Maidenhair trees are to be planted along the two streets. Eight new 15 gallon Red Maples are to be planted along the southern (rear) elevation. The two existing Ornamental Pear trees along this elevation will remain. A climbing vine, Boston Ivy, is proposed along the western and southern property lines to provide screening and to enhance the perimeter landscape. Additional species to be installed on the ground floor are Fern Pine, New Zealand Flax, Bulbine, Berkeley Sedge, and Mat Rush. The ground floor flow through planters are to have Dwarf Coffeeberry, Berkeley Sedge, Barberry, Deer Grass, Black Elderberry, and Yarrow. With the exception of Berkeley Sedge, and Barberry, the same four species described above are to be installed on the second floor through planter. The rooftop planting is to be Bamboo and grass.

The majority of the landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the building, and along the western and southern property lines. The rooftop area of the proposed building illustrates an outdoor cooking area, and three outdoor seating areas. There is a shed roof at the western end of the fourth floor outdoor roof area and an additional landscaping area, consisting of bamboo, to create a physical buffer to the adjacent residential use.

Art in Public Places

The project is required to comply with Chapter 13.50, Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The applicant will be constructing a sculptural element above the entryway into the building along Jefferson Avenue. This sculptural element is to be of exterior grade polycarbonate semi-translucent panels in Lime Green. This same lime green polycarbonate material is used as the railing feature on some of the balconies of the proposed building.

Monetary Contributions to the Community

To understand the direct and indirect contributions to the community, staff has created a list illustrating the financial contributions that will be made by the applicant related to this project. Some are directly submitted to the City of El Cerrito. Others are submitted to community agencies such as the West Contra Costa Unified School District and West County Transportation Advisory Committee. These contributions are over and above what is required for their fair share of impacts to the Complete Streets
component of the Specific Plan referenced below, any fees paid to the Stege Sanitary District and any building and planning user fees needed for processing the entitlement, plan review and inspection of the project during the construction phase.

1. An in-lieu fee of $14,470.14 to meet the required public open space that is not being provided by the project. While this is a development standard, since it is being paid as an in-lieu fee, the money will be given to the Public Works Department to further enhance existing and proposed public open space.

2. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project. (64,555 sq. ft. x 5.02= $324,066.10) This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

3. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (50 du x $1,648= $82,400). This is collected by the City and transferred to West County Transportation Advisory Committee to assure that new development in West County pays its fair-share toward regional circulation and transit improvements that are proportional to the traffic impact the new development will generate. The local fees collected in West County provide congestion relief to mitigate traffic on regional routes and through improved transit service.

Total community contribution of this project is estimated to be $420,936.84.

*Denotes that these fees change on a periodic basis and are due at building permit. As construction plans typically take 12 to 18 months to complete, these fees may have changed by the time payment is due.

**Complete Streets Plan**

The project will be required to make a fair-share contribution toward the improvements contained in the Complete Streets chapter of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. These improvements will be made as funds become available. For San Pablo Avenue, which is a Community Street, the improvements include installing landscaped pedestrian bulb-outs, creating a crosswalk which decreases the crossing distances for pedestrians, and providing a new bicycle lane.

**Comment from the City of Richmond**

Attachment 3 is the comment letter from the City of Richmond Design Review Chair about the project. The Design Review Chair is very supportive of the project, and Form Based Codes, and provides recommendations about specific design details:

1. The possibility for additional landscaping along Jefferson Avenue, and softening the transition along the western elevation of the building to the residential units along this street.
   
   Staff notes installing additional landscaping along Jefferson would require the public plaza area to be redesigned. These public spaces are encouraged by the Specific Plan, and staff and the applicant worked to create an inviting public plaza area for the project.

2. The potential to install an espalier (landscaping against a building) along this elevation to address the proposed stucco wall adjacent to the apartment building to the west.

   Staff notes an espalier feature along the proposed building would have little visual impact to soften the appearance of the western elevation of the proposed building. There is a 5 foot setback between the existing and proposed building, with a pathway that wraps around the western and southern elevations of the project. Staff does not believe that this additional landscaping feature is appropriate at this location.
3. Reducing the boxy feel of the building with more artful roof overhangs.

Staff notes that the art piece above the entry on Jefferson is a distinguishing feature on the building for the shape, color and materials to be used. There are no other overhangs proposed for the building. There are many aspects of articulation along the building elevations with the recessed area along Jefferson Avenue, and recessed areas along the southern elevation. Additionally, there is a variety of materials and colors along all elevations to created visual interest on the building.

4. Making the art/entry structure warmer and more organic, and of a human scale design. Use IPE wood that is shown on the balconies at this location.

Staff notes that the wood balconies are to be either a cedar/redwood or similar acetylation wood material, and not IPE. There is a variety of colors and materials proposed for the building, with a wood or similar grain material that adds warmth to the proposed building. The scale and design of the art/entry overhang is meant to shield residents and patrons from the weather, and be the interface between public and private space. Staff appreciates the interesting use of a sleek material at this location for the public art for the project as well as a distinctive accent element that identifies the residential entry to the building.

5. West elevation needs warmth.

Staff notes that the design of the proposed building anticipates a proposed transition between the adjacent residential properties with balconies on the second floor of the proposed building. These private balconies soften the transition between these adjacent properties with open areas, and add warmth to the proposed building.

6. Any LED lighting needs to be 2500-3000K max, and building lighting shall be indirect (either up or down lighting).

Staff notes that the City has performance standards in the Section 19.21.050(A), General Site Standards, of the Municipal Code that requires that all exterior lights shall be shielded to prevent glare across property lines. This standard must be incorporated on plans that are submitted for building permit issuance.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site and posted at the site on March 14, 2018.

Staff received written correspondence from two parties. Copies of the correspondence are attached to this staff report and staff summary responses are included below.

RANC Comment Letter (Attachment 4)

Staff received a comment letter from the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC) dated February 5, 2018. These comments are related to the proposed project (10963 San Pablo Avenue), and a project that is under review at 10919 San Pablo Avenue. Thematically, the letter was separated into three parts:
1. It recommends the inclusion of items such as site plan, elevations, parking, photo simulations, and a traffic impact analysis.

   Staff notes all of these items are included in the development proposal’s plan set and supporting documentation.

2. It notes how neighboring municipalities approach the integration of a taller building next to a residential neighborhood with lower building heights.

   Staff notes that the project is fully compliant with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the building stepping back to meet the required daylight plane and to avoid unacceptable shadow impacts.

3. It recommends that the project provide at least one vehicle parking space per unit; differentiation of parking ratios between intensive commercial uses and less intensive commercial uses; and the inclusion of guest parking.

   Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of parking. The Plan does not require guest parking to be accommodated on site, it also does not require parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square feet. Staff agrees that the residential parking ratio is less that one vehicular space per dwelling unit. However, the applicant has agreed to measures listed in the Transportation Demand Management Plan, included in Attachment 2, which was prepared by a registered transportation engineering firm. The TDM Plan notes that with these measures, the project should be able to accommodate its parking requirements on site. A detailed discussion regarding the issue of vehicular parking is included in this staff report.

**A key Comment Letter (Attachment 5)**

This correspondence is also related to the proposed project (10963 San Pablo Avenue), and a project that is under review at 10919 San Pablo Avenue. Thematically, the letter was separated into six parts:

1. **Private property lines and drainage;**

   Staff notes that private property line issues and private drainage agreements between properties are a civil matter.

2. **Fencing between the properties.** Specifically that the project’s fence be contained completely on its own property, that it be seven feet in height and be made of materials specified for a project proposed at 10919 San Pablo Avenue.

   Staff notes that the proposed fence for the project shall be required to be located completely on its own property. The fence is currently proposed to be six feet in height and made of wood, however, if the Board would prefers, the fence could go up to eight feet in height and could be made of masonry, stucco or plaster. Staff recommends that the aesthetic of the proposed fence should reflect the proposal on the subject property.

3. **Proposed tree planting along the southern property line could provide maintenance concern.**

   Staff notes that the trees proposed along the southern property line serve as a buffer between the two properties and provide color, shade and privacy during the spring and summer months. The proposed planting plan shows leaving two ornamental pear trees and adding a line of eight Red Maples.
4. Site security during construction.

Staff notes that security fencing is allowed/required during the construction process. Further, the El Cerrito Police Department will work with the development team to help identify ways to secure the site, to the extent possible as issues are identified.

5. Parking should be set at one space per dwelling unit.

Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of parking. Staff agrees that the residential parking ratio is less that one vehicular space per dwelling unit. However, the applicant has agreed to measures listed in the Transportation Demand Management Plan, included in Attachment 2, which was prepared by a registered transportation engineering firm. The TDM Plan notes that with these measures, the project should be able to accommodate its parking needs on site. A detailed discussion regarding the issue of vehicular parking is included in this staff report.

6. Noise and dust control; and

Staff notes that noise and dust control is addressed in the environmental document. Additionally, conditions of approval that are mitigation measures of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the review of the Specific Plan area included in the draft Resolution.

7. Hours of construction.

Staff notes that the El Cerrito has citywide regulations limiting the duration of construction activities. This information is also included in the draft Resolution. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

Environmental Review

A Program Environmental Impact Report (program EIR) was certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in 2014. This type of environmental documentation is authorized by section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for use in documenting the environmental impacts of specific plans, and other planning “programs.” As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR is useful in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of a project that involves a series of interrelated actions that can reasonably be characterized as a single project. Subsequent activities that fall within the scope of the program may not be subject to further environmental review if the environmental effects of the subsequent activity have been adequately addressed in the program EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist has been prepared for this project (Attachment 2). The responses contained in the checklist confirm that the project is considered within the scope of the evaluation completed for the program EIR. No new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required.

Several conditions of approval have been included in the draft resolution to ensure that key mitigation measures of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR are implemented with regard to this
project. The inclusion of these conditions ensures that the project will not have environmental effects which have not previously been addressed in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR.

**Intent of the Specific Plan**

The project will implement the following strategies of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan:

**Strategy A.3:** Optimize Placemaking in all developments.

The project addresses San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenues with entries onto these two streets and landscaping improvements within the public-right-of-way. The project will continue to enhance the San Pablo Avenue corridor, as a place, by bringing more residential units to this location of El Cerrito. A new public plaza area along Jefferson has been created to activate pedestrian activity on this street, and to create a gathering spot for residents of the proposed building as well as the existing Jefferson Avenue residents.

**Strategy A.4:** Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.

The project site fronts onto San Pablo Avenue, a Community Street, and Jefferson Avenue, a Neighborhood Street. The project creates a relationship to the variety of small retail uses, and personal services (United States Post Office, personal services consisting of a bank, and veterinary service to the north of the proposed building), and two local churches in the immediate neighborhood. The proposed project will enhance the existing commercial environment along this area of San Pablo Avenue.

**Strategy B.1:** Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit).

The project will provide 50 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the two El Cerrito BART stations. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will provide a pleasant pedestrian environment along Jefferson Avenue.

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project utilizes a large portion of an underdeveloped lot with a surface parking lot area. The proposed project will provide 50 new residential units in close proximity to public transit in the San Pablo Avenue, and the mid-town zone.

**Strategy B.3:** Build on recent and planned private and public investments.

The applicant proposes to add 50 new residential units to an underdeveloped parcel with existing businesses, and a surface parking area into housing. Additionally, a new outdoor public plaza area and public art, both proposed for Jefferson Avenue, will enhance the proposed project. Private open space is proposed with balconies and a fourth floor roof deck.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 50 new residential units by converting an existing underdeveloped commercial building and surface parking area into a new building in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.
General Plan Compliance

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

*The project will provide 50 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses.*

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

*In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.*

**LU4.1: Mixture of Uses.** Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

*The proposed project will enhance the mixture of uses along San Pablo Avenue. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, public transit and the Ohlone Greenway. The design of the project will allow for surveillance of the street, enhancing public safety.*

**LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives.** To the extent possible, encourage alternatives to the use of private automobiles. Encourage a full range of transportation options – driving, transit, walking and biking – without allowing any one to preclude the others. On San Pablo Avenue, in many constrained right-of-ways, it is not possible to provide optimum facilities for all user groups and in the event that trade-offs are necessary, transit users and pedestrians are the highest priority.

*The location of the project provides convenient access to frequent public transit along San Pablo Avenue as well as the two El Cerrito BART stations. The location also provides convenient walking access to local businesses.*

**CD1.9: Building Design.** A variety of attractive images will be achieved by encouraging a variety of building styles and designs, within a unifying context of consistent “pedestrian” scale along streets and compatibility among neighboring land uses.

*The proposed project is designed at a pedestrian scale and is compatible with the existing residential uses to the south, east and north of the site.*

**CD2.1: Street Frontages.** Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

*The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue (and a portion of Jefferson Avenue) and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto both streets. A main door onto Jefferson Avenue provides lobby access to the residential units. Commercial space is located along San Pablo*
Avenue; the Manager’s Office for the proposed building and the public plaza, with its variety of active uses, is along Jefferson Avenue. These different commercial and active uses allow residents of the proposed building, existing residents of the neighborhood, and patrons of the commercial space to assemble at this location. Residential units are above the ground floor and allow surveillance of the street from the units within the project.

**CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements.** Maintain an active program of street tree planting and improved roadway landscaping through both public and private means. Design guidelines shall describe appropriate types of trees for commercial areas – to enhance the shopping experience rather than detract from it.

*The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan implemented standards and requirements for public right-of-way improvements.* The project is consistent with the standards and will enhance the adjacent public rights of way in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

*The project features an open rooftop deck for common/private open space on the fourth floor of the proposed building. Private common open space is being created with balconies on many of the units. Shared common internal recreational spaces are proposed within the building with a gym and yoga room on the second and third floors. Two separate shared work spaces are proposed for the fourth and fifth floors.*

**CD3.3: Site Landscaping.** Improve the appearance of the community by requiring aesthetically designed screening and landscaping on public and private sites. Ensure that public landscaping includes entry areas, street medians, parks, and schools. Require landscaping for all private sites, yard spaces, parking lots, plazas, courtyards, and recreational areas.

*The project has provided landscaping in conformance with the standards in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. New street trees will be installed Jefferson and San Pablo Avenues, at the ground floor level, along the western and southern property lines, and on the fourth floor roof deck area.*

**CD3.12: Landscape Species.** Indigenous and drought-tolerant species that reduce water usage and are compatible with El Cerrito’s climate are encouraged.

*The proposed plant palette includes native, drought-tolerance plants such as Maidenhair, Red Maples, Fern Pine, New Zealand Flax, Bulbine, Berkeley Sedge, and Mat Rush. Dwarf Coffeeberry, Barberry, Deer Grass, Black Elderberry, and Yarrow, and various succulents.*

**CD4.2: Building Articulation.** Ensure that buildings are well articulated. Avoid large unarticulated shapes in building design. Ensure that building designs include varied building facades, rooflines, and building heights to create more interesting and differentiated building forms and shapes. Encourage human scale detail in architectural design. Do not allow unarticulated blank walls or unbroken series of garage doors on the facades of buildings facing the street or the Ohlone Greenway.

*The proposed building is articulated in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with residential entry along Jefferson Avenue, and commercial entry along San Pablo Avenue.*
**CD5.1: Design Review Process.** Continue design review and approval process for all new development, changes, additions, and modifications of existing buildings (except for single-family homes on existing lots).

*The proposed project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board in compliance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**T2.1: Land Use Patterns.** Recognize the link between land use and transportation. Promote land use and development patterns that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. Emphasize high-density and mixed land use patterns that promote transit and pedestrian travel. Where feasible, emphasize the following land use measures:

1. Promote conveniently located neighborhood complexes that provide housing and commercial services near employment centers and within transit corridors.

2. Promote land use patterns that maximize trip-linking opportunities by assembling uses that allow people to take care of a variety of daily needs.

3. Encourage pedestrian-oriented land use and urban design that can have a demonstrable effect on transportation choices.

4. Direct growth to occur along transit corridors.

5. Encourage retail, commercial, and office uses in ground floor space in combination with upper-floor housing along San Pablo Avenue.

*The project will provide 50 new residences in close proximity to public transportation and local businesses. In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the project will add housing units along San Pablo Avenue, a major transit corridor.*

**T2.2: Project Design.** Projects should be designed to include features that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.

*The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo and Jefferson Avenues and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto both streets with a main door onto Jefferson Avenue for stairway and lobby access to the residential units.*

**H2.2:** Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

*The project provides higher-density housing along a transit corridor consistent with the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*

**H2.3:** Continue to enforce the sections of the Zoning Ordinance that increase density, reduce parking requirements, and establish design and development standards to create inviting, mixed-use neighborhoods around transit, and enforce the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

*The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan reduced parking requirements and eliminated maximum density in the plan area. This project will enhance the mix of uses in the corridor adjacent to public transit. The project complies fully with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.*
Required Findings
Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.D.4 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, in acting to approve or conditionally approve an application for a Tier IV application, the Design Review Board shall make the following findings:

a. That the project complies with all applicable Specific Plan design standards;

As discussed in the staff report, the project complies with all standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

b. That the project implements applicable goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan.

As discussed in this report, the proposed project will implement the following goals of the El Cerrito General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.3: Site Landscaping, CD3.12, Landscape species; CD4.2 Building Articulation; CD5.1, Design Review Process; T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, Policies H2.2, and H2.3.

Staff Recommendation
Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of Planning Application No. PL17-0084, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion
Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB 18-01 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL17-0084, a project that includes a 5-story residential building containing 50 dwelling units located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period
Within ten (10) working days after the date of the decision, the Design Review Board action may be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Attachments
1. Draft Resolution
2. Initial Study Checklist
3. Comment letter from Jonathan Livingston, City of Richmond Design Review Board Chair, received by the City of El Cerrito on March 21, 2018
4. February 5, 2018 comment letter from the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council (RANC)
5. March 15, 2018 Comment Letter from Blair Akey
6. Project Plans, dated February 27, 2018
7. CEQA Appendices found here (see website)
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO DESIGN REVIEW BOARD GRANTING TIER II DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING CONTAINING 50 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10963 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on a Community Street and a Neighborhood Street;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 509-110-015, and 017;

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2017, the applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on November 7, 2017, the applicant was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on April 4, 2018, the Design Review Board, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The project is consistent with the Program Environmental Impact Report certified for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c) and 15182 and is subject to the Program Environmental Impact Report mitigation measures listed below.

2. The project complies with all applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project complies with the standards for the San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street type and Neighborhood Street type, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use district, and all other applicable standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.


Now, Therefore, Be It RESOLVED that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Design Review Board hereby approves Application No. PL17-0084, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Division:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated February 27, 2018. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs the building or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this design review shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The applicant shall share the conditions of approval with their general contractor for the project. The general contractor shall sign a copy of the conditions of approval to acknowledge that he/she is aware of all these conditions of approval and will comply as directed.
   a. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, this signed copy shall be returned to the planning and building division and kept as part of the project file. The conditions of approval shall be reviewed at the mandatory pre-construction meeting held between the City and the General Contractor. A copy of the conditions of approval shall be maintained on the project site at all times during construction.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Chapter 13.50: Art in Public Places of the El Cerrito Municipal Code to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The project shall be fully compliant with Chapter 13.50 prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

7. Prior to the Certificate of Occupancy, the Applicant/Developer shall record an easement on the part of the property that is designated as privately-owned public open space to identify that area for that use in perpetuity, to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The Applicant/Developer shall also affix permanent, durable signage in this open space area educating the community that this area is available for public use from dawn to dusk. The in lieu fee ($14,470.74) for the balance of the public open space shall be payable prior to the issuance of the building permit.

8. In compliance with Chapter 16.34 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, the applicant shall submit plans for undergrounding of utilities adjacent to the project to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permit.

9. The cost of all automobile parking shall be separate from the sale or rental price of all residential units. All renters and/or buyers of market rate residential units shall be free to not rent and/or purchase parking.

10. A construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees.
This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit to allow this use.

**Conditions based on applicable mitigation measures from the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Program EIR:**

11. **Aesthetics and Visual Resources. (Mitigation 4.2):** The project shall install landscaping and incorporate other measures into and around parking structure(s) (light source shielding, etc.) as necessary to ensure that potential light and glare from vehicles would be avoided toward the Ohlone Greenway, residential uses, and other sensitive uses, consistent with El Cerrito City Resolution 82-9 and the El Cerrito design review process.

Regarding reflective building materials, for all future development in the Specific Plan area, facades shall be of non-reflective materials, and windows shall incorporate non-reflective coating.

12. **Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.1):** Implement the following Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. City staff will spot check that these measures are being implemented throughout the construction phase of the project. These measures reduce diesel particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 created from construction to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced:

**Dust (PM2.5 and PM10) Control Measures:**

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times.
- b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
- d. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas that are inactive for 10 days or more).
- e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.
- f. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph.
- g. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- h. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site.
- i. Post a publically visible sign(s) with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

**Additional Measures to Reduce Diesel Particulate Matter and PM2.5 and other construction emissions:**

- j. The developer or contractor shall provide a plan for approval by the City or BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (>50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average for the year 2011.
- k. Clear signage at all construction sites shall be posted indicating that diesel and gasoline equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks
waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site or adjacent to the construction site.

l. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
m. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.

13. Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 5.2): Prior to issuance of building permit the applicant shall require project-level construction health risk assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. This assessment shall be completed either through screening or refined modeling to identify impacts and, if necessary, include performance standards and industry-recognized measures to be accomplished through, though is not limited to, the following measures:
   a. Construction equipment selection.
   b. Use of alternative fuels and engine retrofits temporary line power or electric equipment.
   c. Modified construction schedule; and
   d. Implementation of BAAQMD Basic and/or Additional Construction Mitigation Measures for control of fugitive dust.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall implement a program, for review and approval of the Zoning Administrator, that includes the following elements:
   a. Archeological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Procedures for reporting archeological discoveries

15. Biological Impacts (Mitigation Measure 6.1): Removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31 shall require a survey for nesting birds by a qualified wildlife biologist to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. The survey shall be conducted no sooner than 14 days prior to the start of removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation. Survey results shall be valid for 21 days following the survey. Any removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation more than 21 days after a survey shall require a new survey. The area surveyed shall include all construction sites, access roads, and staging areas, as well as areas within 150 feet outside the boundaries of the areas to be cleared or as otherwise determined by the biologist.

In the event that an active nest is discovered in the areas to be cleared, or in other habitats within 150 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until a wildlife biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts.

A qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for bats and suitable bat roosting habitat at work sites where culverts, structures and/or trees would be removed or otherwise disturbed prior to the initiation of construction. If bats or suitable bat roosting habitat is detected, CDFW shall be notified immediately for consultation and possible on-site monitoring.

The survey for nesting birds, bats and suitable bat roosting habitat may be conducted simultaneously.

16. Historic and Cultural Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.2): If subsurface archeological or cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds following the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 7-3 of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. If human remains are found, special rules set forth in State Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) shall apply, and there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area
reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Contra Costa County Coroner has been notified of the remains and has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

17. Paleontological Resources (Mitigation Measure 7.3): The applicant shall implement a program that includes the following elements:
   a. Paleontological resource identification training procedures for construction personnel
   b. Spot-checks by a qualified paleontological monitor of all excavations deeper than seven feet below ground surface
   c. Procedures for reporting paleontological discoveries and their geologic context

If subsurface paleontological resources are encountered, excavation shall halt in the vicinity of the resources, and the project paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and its stratigraphic context. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. During monitoring, if potentially significant paleontological resources are found, "standard" samples shall be collected and processed by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils. If significant fossils are found and collected, they shall be prepared to a reasonable point of identification. Excess sediment or matrix shall be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of material collected and identified shall be provided to a local museum repository with the specimens. Significant fossils collected during this work, along with the itemized inventory of these specimens, shall be deposited in a local museum repository for permanent curatorship and storage. A report documenting the results of the monitoring and salvage activities, and the significance of the fossils, if any, shall be prepared and submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

18. Geology and Soils (Mitigation Measure 8.1): As required by the Building Official, subject to City review and approval, the applicant shall complete and implement the geotechnical mitigation recommendations identified in the required site-specific geotechnical investigations and engineering studies, in coordination with City grading permit and building permit performance standards.

19. Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.1): Future development would be exposed to outdoor noise levels exceeding acceptable levels as defined in the El Cerrito and Richmond General Plans. Noise levels inside residential structures proposed in such noise environments would exceed 45 dBA Ldn, the local established land use compatibility threshold. In areas where residential developments would be exposed to an Ldn of greater than 60 dBA, El Cerrito General Plan Policy H3.9 requires the evaluation of mitigation measures for specific projects. In Richmond General Plan Action SN4.A, new noise-sensitive uses that are located in an area with day-night average sound levels (Ldn) of 55 or greater require a noise study report; the report shall identify noise mitigation measures that limit noise to an acceptable level compared to existing conditions.
   a. Utilize site planning to minimize noise in residential outdoor activity areas (shared outdoor space in multi-family developments) by locating the areas behind noise barriers, the buildings, in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible. The goal is a maximum noise level of 60 dBA Ldn from roadway traffic and 70 dBA Ldn from BART noise.
   b. The City of El Cerrito requires project-specific acoustical analyses to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or lower, and the adopted instantaneous noise levels in residential units exposed
to exterior noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn should not exceed 50 dBA Lmax in bedrooms and 55 dBA Lmax in other rooms. Building sound insulation requirements would need to include the provision of forced-air mechanical ventilation in noise environments exceeding 60 dBA Ldn so that windows could be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control noise. Special building construction techniques (e.g., sound rated windows and building facade treatments) may be required where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn. These treatments include, but are not limited to, sound rated windows and doors, sound rated exterior wall assemblies, acoustical caulking, etc. The specific determination of what treatments are necessary will be conducted on a unit-by-unit basis during project design. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, will be submitted to the City, along with the building plans, which shall be revised as necessary or approved prior to issuance of a building permit. Feasible construction techniques such as these would adequately reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or lower and meet instantaneous noise limits.

c. Similar to above, noise insulation features shall be considered on a case-by-case basis for noise-sensitive offices and commercial uses proposed where noise levels exceed 65 dBA Ldn, in order to meet adopted noise standards.

d. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

20. Noise (Mitigation 13.2): New commercial development proposed in the same building as or adjacent to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards.

   a. Noise levels at residential property lines from commercial development shall be maintained not in excess of the General Plan and municipal code limits for the Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. The approval of the commercial development shall require a noise study demonstrating how the business—including loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems—would meet these requirements and would be consistent with the respective City’s noise standards.

   b. Ensure that noise-generating activities, such as maintenance and loading and unloading, are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM.

21. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation Measure 13.3): Construction equipment shall be well-maintained and used judiciously to be as quiet as practical. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce noise from construction activities:

   a. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.

   b. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

   c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as feasible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction area.

   d. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

   e. Pre-drill foundation pile holes to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile.

   f. Construct solid plywood fences around construction sites adjacent to operational business, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses.

   g. If noise conflicts occur which are not irresolvable by proper scheduling, a temporary noise control blanket barrier shall be erected, as determined to be necessary by the Zoning Administrator, along building facades facing construction sites.

   h. Route construction-related traffic along major roadways and as far as feasible from sensitive receptors.

   i. Construction activities (including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements) and excavating, grading, and filling activities (including warming of equipment motors) shall be
limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and to the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Work shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays.

j. Businesses, residences, or noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to construction sites shall be notified of the construction schedule in writing.

k. Designate a “construction liaison” who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the liaison at the construction site.

22. Noise and Land Use Compatibility/Construction Noise (Mitigation 13-4): The following measures are recommended to reduce vibration from construction activities:
   a. Avoid impact pile driving where possible. Drilled piles causes lower vibration levels where geological conditions permit their use.
   b. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
   c. In areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, in close proximity to existing structures, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate vibration mitigation measures that may include the following:
      1. Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities (such as pile driving) and have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration, and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. Vibration limits shall be applied to all vibration-sensitive structures located within 200 feet of the project. A qualified structural engineer should conduct this task.
      2. Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, define structure-specific vibration limits, and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions.
      3. Design construction contingencies that would be implemented when vibration levels approached the limits.
      4. At a minimum, conduct vibration monitoring during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.
      5. When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.
      6. Conduct post-survey on structures under either of these circumstances: (a) when construction monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or (b) when complaints of damage have been made due to construction activities. Make appropriate repairs or compensation when damage has resulted from construction activities.

Project Specific Conditions of Approval:

23. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project applicant shall submit an application for a Lot Merger to the City of El Cerrito to combine parcels 509-110-015, and 509-110-017.

24. The following interior noise reduction measures shall be included for all west facing (facing San Pablo Avenue) units:
   a. Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38.
   b. Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot;
   c. Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC);
d. Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C;
e. Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the applicant may provide a detailed analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis shall be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer and shall outline the specific measures required to meet the City’s 45 dB Ldn and 50-55 dBA Lmax, interior noise level standards. The Zoning Administrator shall approve any substitute measures or alternatives to the measures detailed above.

25. The permanent fence on the west elevation shall all be of wood, and cannot be constructed with chain link. A wood fence shall be illustrated on plans that are submitted for building permit issuance. Chain link fencing is permitted only as construction fencing.

26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and Applicant/Developer shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to implement: 1) Distribution of transit passes (Clipper Cards) to the future tenants of the apartment development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue; 2) designation of the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) the creation of the TDM marketing materials and the details of providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling.

The Applicant/Developer shall deposit the funds for the Clipper cards into an escrow account that is controlled by the City. Yearly compliance and reporting shall be made by the building manager to the City regarding the implementation of the TDM Plan.

Public Works Department:

27. Earthwork and grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

28. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated February 27, 2018 comply with most recently adopted Municipal Regional Permit. Applicant shall use the updated version of the storm water control report as the last submittal was using the old template. See the following links for reference: http://www.cccleanwater.org/new-development-c-3/.

29. Applicant shall provide drainage plan for new roof and any rain leaders. All drainage is encouraged to stay on-site, draining away from the foundations, 10’ from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

30. The project applicant shall be required to make a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal improvements identified by the SPASP.

31. Bike racks to be installed shall meet the current standards and details to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

32. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
33. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a detailed off-site improvements plan.

34. All sidewalk, curb and gutter along the development’s public right-of-way frontages shall be replaced to meet current City and ADA standards and provide continuous, gradual sidewalk width transition from abutting properties to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

35. All improvements on the property frontage shall comply with the standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, including the Complete Streets chapter to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director.

36. Prior to issuance of a building permit and before any work commences related to any street tree, sidewalk and driveway, applicant shall obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

37. New street trees must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before issuance of the building permit. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

Building Division:

38. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.

Fire Department:

39. Compliance with the Fire Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required. The following list is provided to assist the Applicant/Development Team with the preparation of the building plans:

a. Emergency Vehicle Access
   1. Provide code analysis and show on plans how “Emergency Vehicle Access” requirements are met to get within 150 feet of all portions of exterior walls of the first story.

b. Fire Flow Requirements
   1. Provide code analysis of required total firefighting water.
   2. Based on required fire flow, show on plans the number of fire hydrants required and locations based on maximum spacing requirements.
   3. If required, plans for fire service underground shall be submitted for review, approval and permit under separate cover.

c. Fire Riser Locations
   1. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable to the fire department for emergency operations.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected between the two buildings.

d. Gates
   1. All gates shall be operable by the use of a Knox Key.
   2. A “KNOX BOX” shall be installed with keys for all common areas at all gates and doors.

e. Premises Identification
   1. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
   2. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

f. Automatic Fire Sprinklers
   1. Automatic Fire Sprinklers shall be installed throughout the Complex.
   2. Fire sprinkler plans shall be submitted for review, approval and permit.
g. Emergency Egress
   1. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for
      emergency escape or rescue in accordance with CBC 310.4.
   2. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with CBC 310.4.

h. Fire Sprinkler / Underground
   1. Fire riser and FDC locations shall be submitted for review and approval.
   2. Fire FDC’s shall be in locations acceptable for fire department for emergency operations.
   3. Fire FDC’s shall be interconnected with fire sprinklers and standpipes.
   4. Fire Sprinkler Plans shall be submitted for review and approval.
   5. Fire system underground pipe plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

i. Standpipes
   1. Standpipes shall be wet.
   2. Standpipes shall extend to the roof where required.
   3. Fire Department valve connections shall be in the intermediate landings of stairwells.

j. Smoke & Heat Vents
   1. Smoke & heat vents shall be installed on roof above each stairwell.
   2. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with fusible link.
   3. Smoke & heat vents shall be equipped with manual release for emergency operations.

k. Fire alarm System
   1. Fire alarm plans shall be submitted for review and approval.

l. Smoke Detection
   1. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and
      one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).
   2. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.
   3. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

m. Carbon Monoxide Detectors
   1. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas
      where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached
      garages.
   2. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.
   3. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be120 v Powered with battery backup and be
      interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
40. Prior to issuance of building permit, the Applicant/Developer shall submit a plan for construction site
    security to the satisfaction of the Police Chief.

Stege Sanitary District:
41. This applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege
    Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
42. Construction of the new trash room shall be as illustrated on the plans.
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To:        Elizabeth Dunn, AICP, Consulting Planner
City of El Cerrito, Planning Division

From:      Darcy Kremin, AICP, Bay Area Environmental Practice Leader

Date:      March 30, 2018

Re:        California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Documentation for the 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project, El Cerrito, California

This memorandum and its attachments provide a description of the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project) and substantial evidence to confirm that the project is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR) and would have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its EIR, and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the proposed project does not require any further review under CEQA.

The project site is an approximately 0.43-acre lot located at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito, Contra Costa County (APN 509-110-015-5, 509-110-017-1). The project would demolish an existing commercial building and surface parking lot on the site and construct a five-story mixed-use building with 50 market-rate apartment units and approximately 3,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space, as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements.

Attachment A describes the proposed project. This attachment includes a description of the project, location, existing site characteristics, and required approvals and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito is the CEQA lead agency for the project.

The responses in an environmental checklist (included in Attachment B to this memo) prepared for the project demonstrate for each CEQA topic that because the proposed project was evaluated and impacts were mitigated to the degree possible as part of the SPASP and FEIR, no additional CEQA review is required. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in a program EIR. The responses in the checklist confirm that the project was considered within the scope of the evaluation in the SPASP FEIR; no new impacts were identified and no new mitigation measures are required. This analysis finds that a Notice of Exemption may be prepared for the project and filed with the Contra Costa County Clerk.
The following describes the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project), which is located in the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (SPASP). This section includes a summary description of the project location and existing site characteristics, required approvals, and entitlements. The City of El Cerrito (City) is the lead agency for review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**PROJECT SITE**

The following section describes the location and characteristics of the project site and provides a brief overview of the existing land uses in the project vicinity.

**LOCATION**

The project site is approximately 0.43 acre (18,259-square-foot lot) and is in Contra Costa County at 10963 San Pablo Avenue on the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The site is approximately 1 mile northeast of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay. Regional vehicular access to the project site is via Interstate 80 (I-80) located to the west of the site; the El Cerrito del Norte BART station is 0.7 mile south of the site. AC Transit bus service is available within 0.25 mile of the project site.

The project site’s bordering streets are Jefferson Avenue to the north and San Pablo Avenue to the east. There is a “no build” easement on the southern edge of the property limits, approximately 140 feet long and 10 feet wide.

The general area is surrounded by developed commercial and residential properties. *Figure A-1, Project Regional Vicinity*, shows the site’s regional and local context. *Figure A-2, Project Location*, depicts the project site and surrounding land uses. *Figure A-3* shows the existing site plan for the project site.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS**

The project site is generally level and consists of two adjacent parcels in Richmond (APN 509-110-017-1) and El Cerrito (APN 509-110-015-5). The El Cerrito parcel is on the eastern portion of the site and is an approximately 0.35-acre parallelogram-shaped parcel of land with an approximately 9,135-square-foot one-story commercial building and associated paved and landscaped areas. The Richmond portion of the site is approximately 0.07 acre bordering Jefferson Avenue to the west and is used primarily for parking.

As stated in Section 2.03.04 of the Form-Based Code, a parcel that lies across jurisdictional boundaries is subject to the entitlement process of the jurisdiction in which it has the most land acreage. The other jurisdiction will remain a responsible agency, and projects may be subject to additional design review.

The one-story commercial building is currently occupied by three businesses: a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade/museum. The site is generally flat and slopes west to east and south to north. Approximately 7,000 square feet of asphalt and concrete are used as a parking lot, which is accessible from a driveway along Jefferson Avenue. A total of 20 striped parking spaces are currently on the site. A concrete access ramp is located on the south side of the building, and a wooden access ramp is on the building’s west side. Approximately 1,700 square feet of landscaped area is primarily on the western perimeter of the building.
The sparse vegetation on the site consists of street trees lining the sidewalks and patches of grass and shrubs around the perimeter and throughout the site.

Utilities, including water, electric, natural gas, and sewage service, are readily available.
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EXISTING GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Medium-Density Mixed Use (TOMIMU) in the City’s General Plan. In addition, the site is zoned as TOMIMU. The TOMIMU designation allows for mixed-use development with a 55-foot height limit. The surrounding properties include multifamily residential buildings to the north, east, and west of the project site, with a mixed-use residential and retail building is to the south of the site.

SAN PABLO AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN

In 2014, the City of El Cerrito adopted the SPASP to provide a guide for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that can be applied along the roadway’s length and to adjacent areas. The SPASP creates a framework for transforming San Pablo Avenue into a multimodal corridor that functions as a place that can provide a multitude of opportunities for living, working, and community life. SPASP key principles are to deepen a sense of place and community identity, attract private investment, strengthen partnerships, enhance the public realm, promote the everyday use of transit, walking, and biking, and foster environmental sustainability.

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP were evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Report (SPASP FEIR). The SPASP FEIR, certified in 2014, evaluates the environmental impacts of approximately:

- 1,706 units of residential development;
- 3,840 new residents; and
- 243,112 square feet of commercial floor area.

The SPASP includes a Form-Based Code that regulates development along the corridor, a plan for complete streets, and infrastructure analysis. The complete streets plan addresses circulation and public investment needs along San Pablo Avenue and adjoining streets to attract inexperienced users to the area, while proactively mitigating the impacts of future population growth on mobility in the SPASP area. The infrastructure analysis identifies the utility providers for San Pablo Avenue, provides a general review of capacity limitations, and recommends feasible improvements and associated costs to avoid significant impacts on the level of service.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and construct a new 39,424-square-foot, five-story, 55-foot-tall podium-style multifamily residential building. The project would include a total of 50 dwelling units and approximately 3,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor along San Pablo Avenue (see Figure A-4, Proposed Site Plan, and Figures A-5, A-6, and A-7, Perspective Project Views). The project would also include private roof decks accessible from the second and fourth floors and from the rooftop. A parking garage with 34...
residential parking spaces would be built along Jefferson Avenue. The project would also include 76 spaces for bicycle parking.

Access to the proposed residential units would be via two entrances along San Pablo Avenue and two entrances from the parking lot at the rear of the project site. The proposed residential units include a combination of studios and 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units, as shown in Figure A-4, Proposed Site Plan. Table A-1 lists elements of the proposed project.

**TABLE A-1**

**10963 San Pablo Avenue Project Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B/1BA</td>
<td>656 SF</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1B/1BA</td>
<td>612 SF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>925 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>782 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2B/1BA</td>
<td>742 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>930 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>2B/2BA</td>
<td>930 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B/2BA</td>
<td>1,338 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3B/2BA</td>
<td>1,175 SF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>446 SF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Area = 39,424 SF
Total Unit Count = 50
Commercial Floor Space = 2,989 SF

Parked
Residential Automobiles = 34 units
Bike Parking Short-term = 6 units; Long-term = 76 units

Open Space
Public Space = 1,539 SF
Private Space = 5,588 SF

Notes:
1. Units in square feet
2. All parking unbundled
3. Private balconies, yards, and roof decks

**Open Space and Landscaping**

The proposed project would include a total of 5,588 square feet of private open space area in the form of outdoor balconies, courtyard space, and activity areas for residents. In addition, the project would provide 1,539 square feet of public open space.

The project site includes eight trees; six are to be removed and replaced with new trees planted along Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue.
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ACCESS, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

The project would include a parking garage with 31 double-lift parking spaces, 1 individual space, and 2 ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] spaces, for a total of 34 garage parking spaces reserved for residential uses. The parking facility would include three EV charging stations to accommodate electric vehicles. Vehicles would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Avenue. The residential parking would be unbundled from the apartment units, meaning that the spaces would be leased separately from the units.

In addition to vehicular parking, a total of 76 bicycle parking spaces would be included in the interior parking garage and exterior surface lot. Long-term bicycle parking would be in secured corrals in both the southwest corner of the garage and along the south elevation of the building in the southwest corner. Access to long-term bicycle parking would be located along the exterior of the building through side gates located on Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. Bike storage in the garage would be accessible through the lobby or the garage entrance. Short-term parking would be located along the building frontage on both Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. One bicycle stall would be located along Jefferson Avenue and two bicycle stalls would be located along San Pablo Avenue to accommodate a total of six short-term parking spaces.

Pedestrian access to the residences would be provided through a staircase and elevator in the building lobby and a staircase in the garage. The building lobby would be accessible through the main entrance on Jefferson Avenue, through the project garage, and through the walkway on the south side of the project site. The commercial component of the project would be accessible through an entrance along San Pablo Avenue.

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The project site is in an urban area and is currently served by existing utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and telecommunications infrastructure. Most of the existing utilities within the project site would be removed and replaced as required by excavation. Existing and proposed utility connections are discussed below.

Water

Water service in El Cerrito is provided by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). The project would utilize an existing water main located along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. An existing lateral main provides service to the project site near the southeast corner of the property line.

Wastewater

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the proposed project site. An existing sewer main runs along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. No existing lateral service is available.

Stormwater

The project would include 13,550 square feet of impervious surfaces. The project would also include approximately 18,620 square feet of drainage management space. Three bioretention areas would be located on the second-floor roof deck and at ground level on the north and south sides of the proposed building. Additionally, the project would provide 2,093 square feet of
new water-efficient landscaped areas. A preliminary Stormwater Control Plan for the project is presented as Appendix HYDRO.

APPROVALS/PERMITS

The following approvals and permits would be required for the project:

- City of El Cerrito CEQA review, various entitlements including Tier II Design Review, grading, and building permit approvals
- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) water connections
- Stege Sanitary District (SSD) approval of sewer capacity and connections (per SSD Ordinance 7.2 and California Government Code Section 66013(a))
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) electricity and gas connections
- San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) stormwater discharge orders R2-2009-0074 and R2-2011-0083
CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(4) recommends using a written checklist or similar device to confirm whether the environmental effects of a subsequent activity were adequately covered in an environmental impact report (EIR). This checklist confirms that the proposed 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project (project) is within the planning area for the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final EIR (SPASP FEIR) and will have no new significant environmental effects nor substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, and no new mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in the SPASP FEIR. As such, the City of El Cerrito (City) can approve the project as being within the scope of the SPASP covered by its FEIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10963 San Pablo Avenue Project does not require any further review under CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p>| I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As described in more detail in the project description (Attachment A), the 0.43-acre project site is currently occupied by a one-story commercial building with associated paved and landscaped areas. The general area surrounding the property is developed with commercial and residential uses. The project site is approximately 1 mile north of the eastern shoreline of the Richmond Inner Harbor of the San Francisco Bay. The project site is located approximately 0.3 mile east of Interstate 80. There are no designated scenic highways or scenic vistas within 1 mile of the project site.¹,² There would be no damage to scenic resources or scenic highways.

The project would demolish the existing structure and construct a five-story mixed-use residential apartment building as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements. The new building would be constructed on the northeast side of the site.

---


The project would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code and complete streets design and development standards that support and maintain a strong sense of place and visual identity on San Pablo Avenue. These design and development standards are consistent with the SPASP FEIR and are located in Chapter 2, Form-Based Code, and Chapter 3, Complete Streets, of the SPASP.

The city’s location between I-80 and the East Bay Hills affords views of the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco skyline, and Mt. Tamalpais. The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPASP FEIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, the East Bay Hills, and Albany Hill from public rights-of-way, and areas of lower elevation such as hillside homes in El Cerrito and Richmond (Impact 4-1). This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; however, the SPASP FEIR requires individual development projects to complete further evaluation to determine if they meet the standards and guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan addresses views from the public rights-of-way that run east and west, as well as from BART platforms. The project plans modeled the views from Gladys Court, as shown in Figure B-1. This image shows that that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the San Francisco skyline).

The El Cerrito Zoning Administrator determined that a visual analysis was not required from public rights-of-way of east–west streets for the following reasons:

- The project site is located in the central and western portion of the city, which has a lower elevation and is an area where denser development exists along both sides of San Pablo Avenue.

- Existing conditions on site feature views of Albany Hill, partial views of the East Bay Hills, and Mt. Tamalpais. Upon full buildout, the project would feature a five-story residential building that would afford partial views of the San Francisco skyline, Albany Hill, East Bay Hills, and Mt. Tamalpais.

- The project is not expected to obstruct views of scenic vistas (Albany Hill) from public rights-of-way; views of Albany Hill in the project area are largely obstructed by existing development west and south of the site.

- The project would be consistent with the San Pablo Avenue complete streets design requirements set forth by Chapter 3 of the Specific Plan.

- Streets that run east and west with the potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Jefferson Avenue and Alameda Avenue. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site looking west to Jefferson Avenue and Alameda Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Jefferson Avenue may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the Jefferson Avenue public right-of-way.

---

FIGURE B-1
Existing Project Viewshed

Source: Michael Baker International, 2018
The SPASP FEIR also found that potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but it concluded that implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, which requires the installation of nonreflective building materials and windows, would reduce potential glare impacts of individual development projects to a less than significant level. The project would implement Mitigation Measure 4-2 and would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. No new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2, are required.

**Conclusion**

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR; it is within the allowable height limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts related to the project, and there would be no new impact on visual and aesthetic resources.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site area is on a developed parcel, and there are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the project site. The SPASP area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation.4 El Cerrito and the SPASP area do not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project is also not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract.5 The project site is a combination of primarily commercial and light industrial purposes, is not currently used for any type of agricultural or forestry use, and is not zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The project site does not meet the definition of forestland provided in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) due to its location in an intensely developed area, which would preclude the management of any forestry resources. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant impact on agriculture or forestry resources.

---


### AIR QUALITY

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with federal and state standards for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Air quality setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 5 – Air Quality of the SPASP FEIR.

### Discussion

**Clean Air Plan Consistency**

An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a nonattainment area. The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with the requirements of federal and state air quality standards. The SPASP FEIR stated the SFBAAB was nonattainment for ozone, fine particulate matter (PM\(_{2.5}\)), and coarse particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\)), and there have no changes in attainment status for the air basin since certification of the SPASP FEIR.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines were used for the analysis in the SPASP FEIR to determine whether the Specific Plan would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. When the SPASP FEIR was prepared, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan was the applicable plan. The plan laid out a comprehensive strategy to reduce emissions of ozone precursors, particulate matter (PM), greenhouse gases, and toxic air contaminants. The plan included 18 Stationary Source Measures (SSMs), 10 Mobile Source Measures (MSMs), 17 Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), 6 Land Use and Local Impact Measures (LUMs), and 4 Energy and Climate Measures (ECMs). The SPASP FEIR (page 5-16) concluded that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would increase at a lower rate under the SPASP than population or service population growth, resulting in a less than significant impact related to consistency with the then-applicable clean air plan.
The BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 Clean Air Plan, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. As described in the 2017 plan, all of the 2010 TCMs were carried forward into the 2017 Clean Air Plan, although the measure descriptions and numbering were updated. In addition, 8 of the 10 MSMs, all 6 LUMs, and all 4 ECMS were carried forward into the 2017 plan. The MSMs primarily address vehicles and their components as they relate to emissions and are not directly applicable to the project. The SSMs are not applicable to the project.

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned. In addition, the project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth impacts than were analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR.

Consistency with the Climate Action Plan is determined by whether the project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts or hinder implementation of control measures (e.g., excessive parking or preclude the extension of a transit lane or bicycle path). As discussed above, project implementation would not substantially increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the 2017 Climate Action Plan and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the plan or designed to bring the region into attainment. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-21) identified that construction activities associated with implementation of the SPASP would result in short-term emissions from construction activities, including site grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and architectural coating. Emissions commonly associated with construction activities include fugitive dust from soil disturbance, fuel combustion from mobile heavy-duty diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, and worker commute trips. During construction, fugitive dust is generated when wheels or blades disturb surface materials. Uncontrolled dust from construction can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 to reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 5-1 requires that BAAQMD-recommended basic mitigation measures be implemented to control PM emissions during construction and BAAQMD-recommended additional measures to reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) and PM$_{2.5}$ and other construction emissions to ensure that short-term health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors are avoided or reduced.

Development of the project would result in similar construction-related, potentially significant short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR, and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 would be required. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts due to fugitive dust (PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$) and diesel exhaust (DPM and nitrogen oxide [NOx]) than were evaluated in the SPASP FEIR. Architectural coating activities during construction would result in emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG). Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provides project screening sizes for different land uses. A mid-rise apartment project

---

7 Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.
of fewer than 240 dwelling units would have construction-related emissions of ROG that would be less than significant. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

The SPASP FEIR evaluated operational emissions and concluded the SPASP would not cause significant increases in VMT compared to service population growth and would not interfere with Clean Air Plan control measures (page 5-23). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in accordance with the BAAQMD significance criteria for plan-level analysis of criteria pollutants and precursors. The project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors (i.e., ROG and NOx). Project-generated increases in emissions would be predominantly associated with motor vehicle use, energy required for commercial and residential building operations, energy used due to water consumption, energy used in solid waste collection and disposal, and area sources such as hearths and use of landscaping equipment. Mobile emissions from vehicle use are the primary source of NOx. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers. The analysis concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR. Per Table 3-1 in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a mid-rise apartment project of fewer than 494 dwelling units would have operational-related emissions of ROG that would be less than significant. The project would contribute to, but would not exceed, operational emissions impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Other Air Pollutants**

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others because of the types of population groups or activities involved. Sensitive population groups include children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, especially those with cardiorespiratory diseases. Residential areas are considered sensitive receptors to air pollution because residents (including children and the elderly) tend to be at home for extended periods of time, resulting in sustained exposure to any pollutants present. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution.

As a mixed-use residential/commercial development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residential buildings adjacent to the project to the west and south. The closest schools are Balboa School approximately 600 feet to the west and St. John the Baptist School approximately 800 feet to the north.

**Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots**

Recognizing the relatively low carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, the BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a project would have a less than significant impact if it would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. As identified in the SPASP FEIR (page16-31), peak-hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the SPASP would be far below this threshold. Since intersections affected by the project would have volumes lower than the threshold of 44,000 vehicles per hour, the impact of the project related to localized CO concentrations would therefore be less than significant.

---

Toxic Air Contaminants and PM$_{2.5}$

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-24) concluded that construction activities could result in short-term emissions of DPM, which is a toxic air contaminant (TAC). DPM emissions would be generated with the use of off-road diesel equipment required for demolition, excavation, paving, and other construction activities. Although the use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic, the SPASP FEIR concluded this would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-2 to reduce potential impacts associated with TAC exposure. Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling. Based on a qualitative screening assessment, the project’s DPM emissions would be limited because the project site is small (0.43 acre) and would not require grading or excavation beyond building footings, which reduces the need for large diesel-powered, off-road equipment. In addition, implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 would substantially further reduce fugitive dust, diesel PM, and diesel exhaust NOx emissions. Therefore, construction-related emissions of TACs would be less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Implementation of the SPASP would allow new residential land uses that could include sensitive receptors, as well as new nonresidential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. For long-term operations, the SPASP FEIR (page 5-25) concluded that if projects under the SPASP are located within the overlay distances in Table 5-7 in the EIR, this would represent a potentially significant impact. SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires a TAC analysis to determine the location of new sensitive receptors within the overlay distances. The project’s residential uses would be within the overlay distances. A health risk screening analysis was completed following the recommended BAAQMD methodology and using the appropriate BAAQMD tools. Four permitted stationary sources were identified within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site: one gasoline dispensing facility, one dry cleaning facility, and two diesel powered emergency generators. The only high-volume roadway identified within the 1,000-foot radius is State Route (SR) 123 (San Pablo Avenue). The project would site new sensitive receptors on the second floor of the building, 22 horizontal feet from the nearest travel lane of SR 123. Using the data from the BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool – Contra Costa County, 20 feet, and the Stationary Source Screening Analysis Tool – Contra Costa County, the increased community screening risk and cumulative risk is shown in Table B-1, accounting for distance using the BAAQMD distance adjustment tools. These risks do not represent the actual health risk to the community; they are conservative screening estimates of maximum risk to determine whether further analysis is required. Community health screening risks are below the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, new sensitive receptor exposure risk due to stationary or mobile source TAC emissions would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

---


### Table B-1
Community Health Risk Screening for Existing Stationary Sources, Highways, and High-Traffic Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Distance (in feet)</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (in one million)</th>
<th>Chronic Hazard Index (HI)</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Concentration ($\mu$g/m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito Public Works (Gas Station)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito Fire Dept. (Generator)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Cleaners (Dry Cleaning)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cerrito (Generator)</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 123 (San Pablo Avenue)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Individual Significance Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sources</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Cumulative Significance Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = not applicable. Distances are from the source to the closest project property line.

### Asbestos-Containing Materials

The project proposes to demolish existing structures on the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed for the project did not identify any asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). However, because the existing structure was constructed prior to 1978, ACMs may be present.

Demolition of the existing structures would be subject to the BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2 – Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing, which regulates the safe handling and disposal of ACM. California Health and Safety Code Section 19827.5 requires that local agencies not issue demolition permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants. In accordance with the state regulation, the BAAQMD must be notified prior to demolition or abatement activities. Compliance with state and BAAQMD regulations would

---

ensure the impacts due to airborne asbestos would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

**Odors**

The SPASP FEIR (page 5-30) identified that the SPASP area would include potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. Most of these major existing sources are, however, already buffered by existing uses. Mitigation Measure 5-4 was adopted to ensure potential land use compatibility impacts due to odors would be appropriately identified and mitigated. Consistent with SPASP policies and SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-4, the project would be in an area surrounded by commercial uses and would not be in an area where substantial odors (such as those associated with industrial, manufacturing, processing, or treatment uses) are generated. This would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation would be required.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 and 5-2, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 5-1 and 5-2. A TAC analysis was prepared in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 5-3, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential air quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with air quality than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.
IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The project is in a highly urbanized area between the El Cerrito and Richmond city limits. The project site is located on 100 percent disturbed land.

Project implementation would largely result in minimal impacts on biological resources because the area is a highly developed urban area with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. There are no plant or animal species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), nor does the plan area contain any federally protected wetlands.13,14 No creeks, wetlands, or

riparian habitats are near or adjacent to the property; therefore, the project would not result in any significant impacts on these habitats.

The SPASP FEIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the SPASP. Removal of existing trees containing nests or eggs of migratory birds, raptors, or bird species during the nesting season could be considered an “unlawful take” under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFWS provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. The project would result in the removal of existing grass and shrubs on the project site. However, tree removal would comply with all City requirements to minimize impacts on biological resources during removal. The FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 6-1 to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less than significant levels.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1, would be required.

Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and the El Cerrito General Plan. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 6-1. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential biological impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on biological resources.
V CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the potential impact of development within the plan area on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Specifically, disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and development of individual project sites within the SPASP area, and there is a reasonable possibility that archaeological and paleontological resources could be uncovered during these activities (Impacts 7-2 and 7-3). The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which would reduce the potential impacts on known or undisclosed cultural resources to less than significant levels.

The SPASP FEIR identified properties or features within the SPASP area that may be eligible for listing in a local, state, or federal register of historic resources (Impact 7-1). While the building on the project site, at 10963 San Pablo Avenue, was not identified in the SPASP FEIR as potentially eligible for listing as a historical resource, it was evaluated for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) because it was identified as being over 50 years of age.

In compliance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-2, a field survey and evaluation for architectural resources was completed, and a records search (#17-1157) was undertaken at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park for the project site and vicinity. However, a field survey for archaeology was not completed because the entire project site is covered with a commercial building and a paved surface parking lot. Based on the records search, there are no known historical or archaeological resources located within the project site. One prehistoric archaeological resource (P-07-004477) was identified approximately 0.25 mile from the project site. P-07-004477 consists of midden soils and shell fragments. Further, this area of El Cerrito has been identified as sensitive for buried prehistoric cultural resources.\\footnote{Koenig, Heidi. 2013. West of Hills Northern Pipelines Project, East Bay Municipal Utility District, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties, Cultural Resources Survey Report. Environmental Science Associates. On file at the Northwest Information Center.}
The commercial building at 10963 San Pablo Avenue was evaluated for inclusion in the California Register to determine if it is a historical resource as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5(a). The evaluation identified 10963 San Pablo Avenue to have significance as one of El Cerrito's oldest buildings; however, it lacks integrity because it is no longer recognizable as a 1902 Italianate-style commercial building. Owners and occupying businesses do not appear to have been influential, and the current architecture is not noteworthy nor associated with a master architect/builder/developer. The building therefore does not appear eligible for listing in the California Register and does not qualify as a historical resource under CEQA. (See Appendix CUL.)

The records search of the project site and the California Register evaluation of 10963 San Pablo Avenue identified no historical or archaeological resources on the project site; however, there is elevated prehistoric archaeological sensitivity and the potential exists for previously unknown cultural resources to be encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site. Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, which specify compliance with existing codes and regulations applicable to the accidental discovery of archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains during construction activities, would be required to be implemented. As such, with implementation of previously identified mitigation measures, the project would have no new impact on cultural resources.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. Ground-disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measures 7-2 and 7-3. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resource impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact on cultural resources.
VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

Discussion

Discussion of potential geology and soils impacts associated with the project are based on the geotechnical investigation, which is presented as Appendix GEO in this report.16

Subsurface Conditions

Boring test results from the project site show alluvial deposits, mostly consisting of hard clays with varying sand content with moderate liquefaction potential. Most recent groundwater testing results for the project site indicate groundwater measurements ranging from 4.8 to 5.7 feet below ground surface (bgs).17


Seismic Conditions
The closest active earthquake faults in the project vicinity are the Hayward, San Andreas, and Calaveras faults. The Hayward fault is approximately 1 mile from the project site and of the three is the closest. Based on U.S. Geological Survey research, the San Francisco Bay Area will likely experience an earthquake magnitude of 6.7 or greater by 2045.18

According to the geotechnical investigation (Appendix GEO), it is likely the project site would experience damage from seismic ground shaking. Risk of damage to the project site from fault rupturing, landsliding, compaction, liquefaction, and lateral spreading is relatively low.

Summary
The SPASP FEIR concluded that the geologic and soil impacts in the plan area are primarily related to potential ground shaking and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the SPASP area is not located in an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. In addition, the SPASP FEIR found that slope instability hazards are also minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the SPASP area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is served by a comprehensive, integrated wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. Neither septic tank systems nor alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the SPASP, including the project.

The SPASP area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward fault or one of the other active faults in the region. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant with compliance with the latest California Building Standards Code. The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with these requirements. In compliance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 8-1, the project applicant has prepared a geotechnical report for the project site (Appendix GEO). The project would also implement project design features and actions discussed in Appendix GEO to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that grading and construction activities within the SPASP area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques outlined in the geotechnical report would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

Applicable Mitigation
No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion
The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code and City-required erosion control techniques. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential geology and soil impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with geology and soils.

VII GREENHOUSE GASES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). Air quality and compliance with state greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change goals and policies for the SFBAAB fall under the regulatory authority of the BAAQMD. GHG science, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 9 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change of the SPASP FEIR.

GHG emissions in this discussion are presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e), which weigh each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO₂e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

Discussion

GHG Emissions

The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain a methodology and thresholds of significance for evaluating GHG emissions. BAAQMD thresholds were developed based on substantial evidence that such thresholds represent quantitative levels of GHG emissions, compliance with which means that the environmental impact of the GHG emissions would normally not be cumulatively considerable under CEQA.²⁰

The BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they should include in the administrative record for the project. The BAAQMD provides the CEQA Thresholds Options and Justification Report developed by staff in 2009 as a reference for lead agencies when determining appropriate thresholds.

The BAAQMD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. The lead agency is encouraged to incorporate best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction, as applicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to, using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet, using local building materials of at least

---

10 percent, and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.\(^{21}\)

For operational emissions, the BAAQMD suggests applying a specific plan-level GHG efficiency threshold of 6.6 metric tons (MT) CO\(_2\)e per year per service population. The SPASP FEIR compared plan-level GHG emissions to the more conservative BAAQMD project-level efficiency threshold of 4.6 MT CO\(_2\)e per year per service population.

In the SPASP FEIR (page 9-7), operational GHG emissions in 2040 were estimated for both traffic scenarios—Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift—using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2. Inputs of land use types, sizes, and trip generation rates from the SPASP were used in the modeling. The SPASP FEIR found that 2040 full development capacity associated with development under the SPASP would have emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MTCO\(_2\)e per year per service population under the Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively, which would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MTCO\(_2\)e per year per service population. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR concluded this impact would be less than significant.

The project’s population and housing units are within the scope of development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, as stated in Section XIII, Population and Housing, of this document. The project would not result in new or more significant population growth than was analyzed and described in the SPASP FEIR. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers, which concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR.\(^{22}\) Therefore, the project would contribute to, but would not exceed, GHG emissions impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Consistency with Adopted Plans to Reduce GHG Emissions**

The SPASP FEIR analyzed this impact (page 9-9) and concluded that the SPASP would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the state and local levels regarding GHG emissions. The plan would also be subject to local and General Plan policies, including the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, that are expected to reduce emissions of GHGs. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

As required by the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill 375), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) developed a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) plan as a component of Plan Bay Area 2040.\(^{23}\) This plan seeks to reduce GHG and other mobile source emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning to reduce VMT. The SPASP furthers these goals locally by supporting higher-density, transit-oriented development that results in a mix of housing types, greater employment density, and community-support services to create a vibrant, walkable Priority Development Area (PDA) supportive of transportation mode shift and economic development.

\(^{21}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, page 4-08.


The El Cerrito Climate Action Plan outlines the most effective actions to reduce locally produced GHG emissions and to create a safer and more sustainable El Cerrito.\textsuperscript{24} The plan outlines a series of sustainable community strategies, which include encouraging more compact, higher-density infill development to reduce VMT. The SPASP supports the goal to create a walkable, bicycle-friendly San Pablo Avenue supported by strong public transportation use, vital commercial activity, a mix of housing types, pedestrian design elements, green infrastructure, and urban green open spaces.

The project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services. The project would develop high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial uses on the site, similar to what the SPASP envisioned and in support of land use planning strategies identified in Plan Bay Area 2040 and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted plans to reduce GHG emissions. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential GHG emissions impacts of the project, and there would be no new impact associated with GHG emissions than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.

---
## VIII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

Hazardous materials impact analysis is based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), which is included as **Appendix HAZ** of this report.\(^ {25} \) The Phase I ESA identifies recognized environmental conditions (REC) indicating the presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum hydrocarbons in structures, soils, groundwater, or surface water on the project site. The Phase I ESA includes a visual evaluation of the presence of asbestos, lead paint, radon, or mold.

---

\(^ {25} \) Basics Environmental. 2015. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. 10963–10979 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, California.*
**Project Site**
As described in the project description of this report, the property is on a 0.43-acre parcel with a one-story, 9,360-square-foot commercial building and associated pavement and landscaped areas. The parcel is bordered by San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue. The commercial space is currently occupied by three businesses: a doughnut shop, a hair salon, and an arcade and museum. There are currently no hazardous materials or other conditions associated with the three businesses. General observations of the rest of the associated paved and landscaped areas did not reveal any obvious evidence of hazardous materials, stains, or spills. No obvious evidence of underground storage tanks, collection drains, sumps, underground hydraulic hoists, distressed vegetation, or surface impoundments were observed on the project site. No wells or groundwater monitoring wells were observed on or near the project site.

**Asbestos**
The current building on the project site was built prior to 1979, and it is likely that asbestos was used in building construction. No evidence of asbestos was evident on the property; however, an asbestos survey was not conducted for the Phase I ESA. To confirm if any asbestos materials are contained within the structure on the subject site, an asbestos survey should be performed by a trained asbestos professional. Since the existing structure would be demolished, an asbestos inspection would be required, pursuant to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP).

**Lead-Based Paint**
Lead-based paint is any paint, varnish, stain, or other applied coating that has 1 milligram (mg) per square centimeter (cm) (or 5,000 µg/g by dry weight) or more of lead. A lead-based paint survey was not conducted as part of the Phase I ESA. However, the existing structure was confirmed to have been constructed before the ban on lead-based paints in 1978; thus, lead-based paints may have been used in its construction. As stated in the Phase I ESA, visual observations showed that the painted surfaces of the structure appeared to be in fair condition with no obvious signs of chipping, cracking, and/or significant health risk concerns (Appendix HAZ).

**Radon**
Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive gas that is odorless, invisible, and without taste. It is released during the natural decay of uranium, which is present in most rock, soil, and water. Radon testing was not conducted at the property as part of the Phase I ESA. However, based on the Map of Radon Zones provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), there is a low potential that radon concentrations at or above 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l) are present at the site. Concentrations at or above 4 pCi/l are considered to be concentrations of concern per the EPA and the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA).

**Mold**
Molds have been found to cause a variety of health problems in humans, including allergic, toxicological, and infectious conditions. A mold survey was not conducted as a part of the Phase I ESA. However, no obvious evidence of mold or water-damaged materials was observed within easily accessible areas of the structure (Appendix HAZ).

**Recognized Environmental Conditions**
Recognized environmental conditions (RECs) are defined as “the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under
conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment.” The Phase I ESA concluded that there were no apparent obvious RECs on site that warrant further investigation or documentation at the time of the evaluation.

Adjacent Properties
A visual assessment of four adjacent properties was conducted for hazards and hazardous materials as part of the Phase I ESA. The properties included three residential apartment buildings and one mixed-use residential/retail complex. No obvious evidence of significant environmental concerns was observed on any of the sites.

Environmental Database Review
Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) compiled data from available government agency databases on locations of actual and potentially impacted sites within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Copies of the environmental database lists and the location map for the subject site are included in Appendix HAZ. Data includes site assessment for soil vapor screening from contaminated soil or groundwater on or near the project site, soil, water, and leaking underground storage tank (LUST) contamination. Databases include the State Water Resources Control Board’s GeoTracker database and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s EnviroStor website. No properties included in EDR’s investigation would pose a significant environmental risk to the project. A complete list of mapped sites is in Appendix HAZ.

Schools
There are several private and public schools within 1 mile of the project site, including St. John the Baptist, Balboa School, Cameron School, Caliber: Beta Academy, Summit Public School, and Windrush School. The closest schools near the project site are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, a private K–8 school, approximately 800 feet to the north.

Airports and Airstrips
The project site is approximately 20 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the plan area; however, a helipad at Doctors Medical Center is approximately 1.5 miles from the SPASP area.

Emergency Response
The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) is responsible for the City’s Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The Cities of El Cerrito and Richmond share reciprocal duties for emergency response services. The Richmond Fire Department (RFD) Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond’s comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and the RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster.

Wildfire Hazards

Areas of Very High Fire Hazard Severity are designated in the El Cerrito General Plan, and a Special Study Map is prepared and maintained by the City’s Building Official. These areas are located near East Bay Regional Park District open space and certain City parks, but the project is not located in the vicinity of a wildfire hazard area.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that there are no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials within the SPASP area. The SPASP did identify the potential to expose construction workers to existing spilled, leaked, or otherwise discharged hazardous materials or wastes during project construction due to the large number of auto-related businesses in the SPASP area. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with all applicable, existing, jurisdictional city, regional, and state mandated site assessment, remediation, removal, and disposal requirements for soil, surface water, and/or groundwater contamination would ensure that potential impacts are less than significant. Specifically, compliance with City of El Cerrito, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and California Department of Toxic Substances Control requirements would ensure that health and safety impacts associated with implementation of individual development projects are less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR determined that the proposed residential, commercial, and open space uses as part of the SPASP would not involve the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to the extent that a significant public or environmental hazard would occur. Operations in the SPASP area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substance such as fuel, paint, and solvents but would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The SPASP determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

According to these requirements, the project would be required to investigate any potential soil or groundwater contamination at the site and comply with existing regulations. As the discussion above states, the Phase I ESA prepared for the project concluded that no existing environmental hazards would impact the project.

The closest schools are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, approximately 800 feet to the north. The project, as a residential mixed-use site, would not result in impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school. Because the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no safety hazards would be anticipated. The SPASP FEIR states that all roadways must be engineered and maintained to support emergency response vehicles and equipment. In addition, the SPASP area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to a wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the
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SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion
The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground-disturbing activities. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials at or affecting the proposed project site, and there would be no new impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The existing site consists of an approximately 9,135-square-foot one-story commercial building and an asphalt parking lot which takes up approximately 7,000 square feet of the site. Landscaping surrounds the parking lot and covers approximately 1,700 square feet of the site, with small areas of concrete walkways making up the rest of the site.

The site slopes from west to east and south to north. Runoff from the bordering existing paved roads is collected in five storm drain inlets (three to the north and two to the south) at the corner of Jefferson Avenue and S. 56th Street in the Richmond city limits; the runoff then discharges to an existing 30-inch storm drain line located in S. 56th Street.
Environmental Checklist

Soil classification for this site is Group D. A geotechnical report describing site soil conditions is presented as Appendix GEO of this report.

Summary

The SPASP FEIR determined that long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP could result in contamination of plan area stormwater runoff with petroleum and other contaminants from motor vehicles. However, compliance with State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and jurisdictional City-required post-construction, non-point-source pollution control measures would ensure that such impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. In addition, the SPASP FEIR determined that compliance with applicable SWRCB and City of El Cerrito water quality protection requirements and conditions would ensure any potential construction period and post-construction water quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Construction projects are also required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of best management practices to control stormwater peak flows and pollutant levels. This requirement is stipulated in Provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). All projects within the SPASP area must comply with NPDES requirements, including the project. The project includes a Stormwater Control Plan presented as Appendix HYDRO of this report. The City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and state requirements as part of the development review process.

The proposed increase in population and traffic associated with the project could increase discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff beyond current levels after partial or full buildout of the SPASP. The project would decrease the amount of pervious surface on the site by replacing the existing 16,477 square feet of impervious surfaces on the site with 13,550 square feet of impervious surfaces. The project would also comply with design specifications and Integrated Management Practices described in Appendix HYDRO. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR identified that portions of the plan area in Richmond along Central Avenue are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the project site is not located in this zone and would therefore not result in any impacts related to flooding. The project is not located near a dam or levee. There are no rivers or streams near the project area. Furthermore, the SPASP area is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the SPASP along Central Avenue in Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the project is not located near this area.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

---


Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be required to comply with existing regulations related to stormwater discharge. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the hydrology and water quality impacts of the project, and there would be no new impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.
### Environment Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

The project site is located on two parcels in the cities of El Cerrito and Richmond. It is expected that the two lots will be merged into one lot within the City of El Cerrito’s jurisdiction prior to the issuance of building permits.

### Summary

The SPASP FEIR concluded that project implementation would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use (commercial/housing) development in the plan area at densities and heights within currently permitted limits. Project implementation would not result in the division of an established community because the area was primarily developed prior to completion of the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor; facilitating development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, and public transportation centers; and promoting compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development patterns and land uses.

The project site is designated TOMIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP and zoned as TOMIMU. The intent of the TOMIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher-density area within 1 mile of BART that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the downtown and uptown areas. The TOMIMU designation allows for a 55-foot height limit (a height of 65 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The project is generally consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

The project is in full compliance with the development and design standards of the SPASP and would go to the City’s Design Review Board. The project would not deviate from SPASP development standards related to building height, length of building façades, new shadows, and transparency of ground-floor uses (see Section I, Aesthetics, for additional discussion). The project would generally comply with the standards of the TOMIMU designation and would develop the site with a mix of high-density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the SPASP FEIR.
No existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan would apply to the project vicinity, and there would be no impact.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial land use changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR, and required by the City of El Cerrito General Plan. Therefore, the project would not result in new impacts related to land use and planning.
### XI  MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project does not involve the loss of an available known resource that would be of value to the region. The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on mineral resources.

---

**Environment Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII</th>
<th>NOISE. Would the project result in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>levels existing without the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, within 2 miles of a public airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An environmental noise study was prepared for the project and is presented as Appendix NOI of this report. Noise setting, standards, and regulatory framework were described in Section 13 – Noise of the SPASP FEIR. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels (dBA) but may be expressed as dB, unless otherwise noted.

**Discussion**

This section compares noise impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. The project would include residential and commercial uses in a developed area in El Cerrito. Operational noise can be categorized as mobile source noise and stationary source noise. Mobile source noise would be attributable to the additional trips that would result from the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by residential and commercial land uses.

An environmental noise study was prepared for the project and is referenced in this section. The noise study is intended to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per SPASP Mitigation Measure 13-1. The study examines the impacts of noise on the proposed noise-sensitive uses of the project site together with the project design features and the applicable city and state noise standards. Future noise level impacts are based on ambient noise measurements conducted at the project site as a component of the noise study.

---
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Traffic on San Pablo Avenue, adjacent to the project, is the primary contributor to the existing ambient background noise. Other components of the existing noise environment include traffic on Jefferson Avenue, adjacent to the project; traffic on Interstate 80 approximately 0.25 mile to the west; noise from the BART train tracks approximately 550 feet to the east; and operational noise from the adjacent commercial and residential uses (e.g., parking lot activities, building mechanical equipment, people talking).

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. As a mixed-use residential/commercial development, the project itself is considered a new sensitive receptor. The closest existing sensitive receptors are multifamily residential buildings adjacent to the project to the west and south. The closest schools are Balboa School, approximately 600 feet to the west, and St. John the Baptist School, approximately 800 feet to the north.

Noise and Land Use Compatibility

The SPASP FEIR found that residential land uses facilitated by the SPASP would be exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 60 dB L_{dn} from traffic noise and 70 dB L_{dn} from BART noise.\(^{34}\) Future noise levels would exceed El Cerrito’s land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The SPASP FEIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-1, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential noise and land use compatibility impacts to a less than significant level.

The noise study identified traffic noise on San Pablo Avenue as the dominant source of noise in the project vicinity. The eastern portion of the project site would have a higher noise level than other areas of the site because it is adjacent to San Pablo Avenue. The noise levels on the San Pablo Avenue side of the site measured 73 dB L_{dn}, and the noise levels on the Jefferson Avenue side of the site measured 64 dB L_{dn}.

The City sets forth normally acceptable noise level standards for land use compatibility and interior noise exposure of new development. Per City Municipal Code Section 19.21-50, the normally acceptable exterior noise level for residential units near is 60 dB L_{dn}. However, the outdoor standard will not normally be applied to the small decks associated with apartments and condominiums; these will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.\(^{35}\) The normally acceptable interior noise level for residential units is 45 dB L_{dn}.

The environmental noise study concluded that some of the project’s residential units would require windows and exterior doors with sound ratings above typical construction-grade materials and that exterior walls might require an additional layer of gypsum board. Figure B-2 shows sound transmission class (STC) rating recommendations for the proposed apartments.

Implementation of the recommendations in the noise study would reduce noise levels in residential areas to below the maximum levels defined by the City’s General Plan policies and Municipal Code. Therefore, the impact of noise on sensitive receptors sited by the project would be less than significant with implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 13-1 and the

\(^{34}\) Measure of community noise.

recommendations of the noise study. This impact would remain less than significant with mitigation, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Consistent with SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-1, the project design shall implement the following measures for all San Pablo Avenue facing units to reduce interior noise impacts in compliance with City noise standards:

- **Interior Noise Control Measures:**
  - Living room and bedroom windows shall have a sound transmission class (STC) rating of 32.
  - Exterior finish shall be three-coat stucco or system with equivalent weight per square foot.
  - Interior gypsum at exterior walls shall be 5/8” Type X or Type C hung on resilient channel (RC).
  - Ceiling gypsum shall be 5/8” type X or Type C.
  - Mechanical ventilation shall be installed in all residential uses to allow residents to keep doors and windows closed, as desired for acoustical isolation.

**Stationary Source Noise Impacts**

The SPASP FEIR identified that implementation of the SPASP would introduce commercial uses adjacent to residential land uses. Specific tenants for the proposed commercial uses have not been identified, but uses could include retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, or cafes. New commercial development proposed along with or next to residential development could result in noise levels exceeding City standards. The SPASP FEIR identified this as a potentially significant impact and identified Mitigation Measure 13-2, which requires site-specific analysis for proposed commercial uses to reduce long-term noise impacts to a less than significant level. A site-specific analysis of the noise levels associated with these uses is provided below.

Implementation of the project would generate various on-site stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, parking lot activities, and solid waste collection and recycling operations. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors in the project vicinity are the residences approximately 60 feet north of the project site boundary.

HVAC equipment is often mounted on rooftops, located on the ground, or located within mechanical rooms. The noise sources could take the form of fans, pumps, air compressors, chillers, or cooling towers. HVAC operations would be required to meet all City noise standards.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
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This concludes our environmental noise study for 10963 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA; please contact us with questions.

FIGURE B-2
Window STC Ratings for Apartments, Floors 2 through 5

Source: CSDA Design Group, 2017
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Precise details of HVAC equipment, including future location, sizing, and any sound enclosures, are unknown at the time of this analysis. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, a conservative level of 80 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ at 3 feet was assumed to represent HVAC-related noise with a location on the building roof approximately centered above the proposed commercial space. These off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 54 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ during the day and 60 dB $L_{\text{max}}$ during the night. Therefore, the HVAC equipment noise would be in compliance with the City’s exterior daytime and nighttime noise standards for residential uses.

The primary parking for the project would be in an enclosed first-floor parking garage. Typical parking noise includes engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, tire noise, and people conversing. These noises would be substantially reduced by the exterior walls of the parking garage and noise levels at nearby residential buildings and would not be expected to exceed the City’s daytime or nighttime noise standards.

Additional on-site stationary noise sources would include delivery trucks and loading noise. Because the proposed retail space is less than 3,000 square feet, deliveries from large trucks would be rare. Deliveries from small trucks and vans would not be of a sufficient number to create a perceptible increase in ambient noise above the existing traffic noise. Therefore, stationary noise impacts due to long-term operation of the project would be less than significant.

Mobile Source Noise Impacts
Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity. The amount of noise varies according to many factors, such as volume of traffic, vehicle mix (percentage of cars and trucks), average traffic speed, and distance from the observer. The SPASP DEIR (page 13-21) found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the SPASP, are not anticipated to increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area, and the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic noise level increases would be less than 1 dB $L_{\text{dn}}$. Cumulative traffic noise increases would not be considered substantial, and the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to increased noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project vicinity. A transportation impact analysis was completed for the project by Fehr & Peers; the analysis concluded that the project trip generation and resulting VMT would be less than that accounted for in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Construction Noise
The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction. Large pieces of earthmoving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 80 to 85 dB measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods.

---

36 $L_{\text{max}}$: The maximum instantaneous noise level experienced during a given period of time.
The SPASP concluded that although construction noise would be localized to the individual site, businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout the plan horizon. Construction would elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dB or higher. Such a large increase in noise levels, although short term in duration, would be a potentially significant impact. The SPASP identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, but concluded that construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

The project would be on a small site, which would limit the size and number of construction equipment in use. In addition, since the project site is flat and already developed, no grading activities would be required. The project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. The project would require the implementation of the Municipal Code, City of El Cerrito General Plan policies, and Mitigation Measure 13-3, as included in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

Construction-Related Vibration
The SPASP FEIR identified that construction projects within the SPASP area may, in some cases, be located directly adjacent to existing structures, including weakened structures. Construction activities may include demolition of existing structures, site preparation work, foundation work, pile driving, and new building erection. Demolition for an individual site may last several weeks and at times may produce substantial vibration. Vibratory driven piles or driving drilled caissons could be used to stabilize building foundations.

Depending on the proximity of existing structures to each construction site, the structural soundness of the existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, vibration levels may be high enough to damage existing structures. Given the scope of the SPASP and the close proximity of many existing structures, groundborne vibration impacts would be potentially significant.

As with any type of construction, vibration levels may at times be perceptible. However, construction phases that have the highest potential for producing vibration (pile driving and vibratory compacting) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time for any individual project site. With the use of administrative controls, such as notifying neighbors of scheduled construction activities and scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with the least potential to affect nearby businesses, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and would not result in a physical or perceived significant impact.

The SPASP FEIR found construction-related vibration impacts to be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4 to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. However, it may not be possible to avoid using pile drivers, jackhammers, and related construction equipment entirely during construction associated with the SPASP. Due to the proximity of development in the area, some of these activities may take place near sensitive areas. In these cases, Mitigation Measure 13-4 may not be sufficient to reduce groundborne vibrations below a level of significance. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Ground Vibration from BART Operations
The SPASP FEIR identified that future development under the SPASP would not expose persons to excessive vibration from BART operations. This impact would be less than significant.
Along the entire SPASP area, BART operates on an elevated platform. According to data in the Federal Transportation Agency (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, vibration levels resulting from BART would be well below the 72 VdB guidelines for Category 2 land uses near the footprint of the elevated structure. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The project is more than 500 feet from the BART tracks. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to any new or more significant groundborne vibration impacts than were described in the SPASP FEIR. This impact would remain less than significant, as identified in the SPASP FEIR.

**Aircraft Noise**

The SPASP FEIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts for the project. The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Aircraft noise is occasionally audible at the project site. However, no portion of the project site lies within the 65 dB CNEL noise contours of any public airport, nor does any portion of the project site lie within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources, and there would be no impact.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4, would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is within the scope of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR. The project would be required to implement SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1, 13-2, 13-3, and 13-4. A noise study was prepared in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measures 13-1 and a significant impact was identified. The noise study identified measures to reduce the impact to less than significant. An analysis of stationary source noise impacts was completed in this discussion in conformance with SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 13-2, and no significant impact was identified. As such, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential noise and vibration impacts of the project, and there would be no new or more severe impacts associated with noise than previously identified in the SPASP FEIR.

---

38 Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is approximately 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Under conditions where there are a frequent number of events per day, the FTA has established thresholds of 65 VdB for Category 1 buildings, 72 VdB for Category 2 buildings, and 75 VdB for Category 3 buildings.

39 CNEL: a weighted average of community noise level over time.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
Project consistency for population and housing is evaluated based on SPASP FEIR potential environmental impacts that could occur with approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. The project would include 2,989 square feet of retail space (a reduction of 6,146 square feet over existing conditions) and 60,560 square feet of residential space. The 2017 population in El Cerrito was 23,549. There are approximately 10,720 housing units in El Cerrito. ABAG expects the number of housing units to increase by about 11.9 percent between 2010 and 2040, to projected total of 12,000 housing units.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the population growth associated with the SPASP would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the SPASP boundaries. SPASP implementation would facilitate the projected residential and commercial growth in a transit-rich, mixed-use plan area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts.

Table B-2 shows the housing and population assumptions evaluated in the SPASP FEIR and shows existing and proposed housing development within the SPASP area. Because the population and housing units proposed by the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with population and housing.

---

Table B-2
Existing and Proposed Housing Units and Population within the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluated in the SPASP FEIR</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Remaining Development Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,706&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>968&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> El Cerrito, City of, Final San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR 2014, El Cerrito General Plan Housing Element 2015.

<sup>b</sup> Estimated population associated with approved units, under construction units, and the project was determined by allowable persons per unit for studio, 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom apartments.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project in and of itself would not substantially contribute to significant population growth in El Cerrito. The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in the SPASP. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the population and housing impacts of the project, and no new impacts would result.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The closest fire station is located at 10900 San Pablo Avenue, approximately 530 feet from the project site.

The El Cerrito Fire Department (ECFD) has automatic aid response agreements with the Richmond Fire Department (RFD), the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, and the Albany Fire Department. For the 2013–2014 fiscal year, the ECFD had 37 personnel; two paramedic assignments were authorized for each responding engine to provide advanced life support services during emergency medical responses. The El Cerrito General Plan states a goal to maintain an average emergency response time for the first fire engine of less than 6 minutes for 95 percent of all emergency calls for service, provided adequate financial resources are available. The RFD has a total of 97 positions: 93 sworn personnel plus 3 administrative staff and an emergency services manager. The RFD has seven fire stations, seven engine companies, one truck company, two rescue units, one HazMat unit, and one breathing support unit. All RFD personnel are trained to the level of EMT-D and HazMat First Responder Operational.

The ECFD is responsible for the City’s Emergency Operations Center and development of the Emergency Operations Plan in the event of a major disaster affecting El Cerrito and the community of Kensington. The RFD Office of Emergency Services leads the City of Richmond’s comprehensive emergency management, including planning and preparedness for, response and recovery from, and mitigation of natural, man-made, and accidental incidents of high consequence. In addition, both the ECFD and RFD participate in the Community Emergency Response Team program, which provides training for fire safety, hazardous material and terrorist incidents, disaster medical operations, and search and rescue to enable its citizens to be self-sufficient for up to 72 hours and beyond in the event of a major disaster.

Project implementation would not require the El Cerrito and Richmond fire departments to expand fire protection facilities and personnel to accommodate additional demand associated with implementation of the SPASP. Specifically, the SPASP FEIR identified that any demand for additional fire protection personnel would be funded by currently adopted public facility fees levied on the new development (in Richmond) and by the annual budget review and allocation (in El Cerrito). Given these factors, impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant. Because the population and housing units would fall within the total development
anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

Police Protection
The El Cerrito Police Department (ECPD) provides community police services through three divisions: Field Operations, Administrative and Support, and Special Operations. The ECPD operates out of the Public Safety Building at 10900 San Pablo Avenue. The City contracts with state and other local agencies to provide and support police services. Police dispatching is contracted with the Richmond Police Department (RPD); criminalist services and animal control services are contracted with Contra Costa County.

ECPD staffing for 2012 included 46 sworn officers and 10.55 equivalent professional staff. Four teams patrol the city 24 hours a day year-round.

Increased demand associated with project implementation would be negligible and would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The SPASP identified police department–required approvals that would ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. In addition, the project falls within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR and would not result in new impacts associated with police services.

Public Schools
The project is located in the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). The following public schools would serve students in the SPASP area: Fairmont Elementary School (K–5), Harding Elementary School (K–5), Madera Elementary School (K–5), Fred T. Korematsu Middle School (6–8), and El Cerrito Senior High School (9–12). None of the schools are in the SPASP area. Table B-3 shows school district student yield factors for 2013.

Table B-3
WCCUSD Student Yield Factors (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Unit Type</th>
<th>Grades K–6 Students</th>
<th>Grades 7–8 Students</th>
<th>Grades 9–12 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached Units</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached Units</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Attached Units</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Davis Demographics & Planning, Inc., April 23, 2013; San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Draft EIR, June 2, 2014
Note: Yield factors represent students generated per household across the school district.

The SPASP FEIR evaluated the impact that the SPASP’s anticipated 1,706 new residences and the associated increase in expected student population would have on the services provided and facilities operated by the WCCUSD. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in district schools over the 25-year horizon of SPASP implementation. The SPASP FEIR concluded that new students would be accommodated in existing schools, and plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. The project would add 50 new housing units and increase the population by 142 residents. These numbers would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR (refer to Section XIII, above); the project would also generate students within the assumptions of the SPASP FEIR. As such, existing school facilities can accommodate the project.
Parks and Recreational Facilities

The City of El Cerrito Recreation Department offers a variety of family activities and programs, including visual arts, sports, tutoring, performing arts, swimming, child care, martial arts, and special events. The department also schedules activities and rentals of buildings, picnic areas, sports fields, and tennis courts. Public parks in the project vicinity include Baxter Creek Park, Central Park, and Cerrito Vista Park.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that the combination of parks and recreation facilities meets the expected park requirements for the SPASP area given the anticipated population associated with implementation of the SPASP. As discussed in further detail in Section XV, Recreation, of this document, the SPASP FEIR concludes that the impacts on parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. The project includes private open space as well as new public open space adjacent to Jefferson Avenue. Additionally, the SPASP FEIR determined that implementation of the SPASP would not facilitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities.

Applicable Mitigation

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluates public service impacts and the project’s impacts are included in and analyzed by the SPASP FEIR. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR. Therefore, the project has no new impacts on public services.
XV RECREATION

| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No New Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No New Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Discussion**

The project would increase the local population by 142 residents, which would be negligible compared to the total population. Open space level of service levels per 1,000 residents are 5 acres for El Cerrito and 3 acres for Richmond. Project implementation would not increase demand for parks and recreational facilities, and SPASP service levels of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents would be maintained.

The project would include a total of 5,588 square feet of private open space in the form of balconies and outdoor courtyard space for residents. In addition, the project would provide commercial and public open space for residents and patrons consistent with SPASP FEIR requirements. Because the population and housing units would fall within the total development anticipated by the SPASP FEIR, the project would conform to SPASP and General Plan open space standards for El Cerrito and Richmond. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial impacts on parks and recreational facilities.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including parks and recreations impacts. Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the SPASP FEIR and General Plan policies. Therefore, the project would have no new impacts on parks and recreation.

---

XVI TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts from the project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. A traffic study and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan have been prepared for the project and are presented as Appendix TRA of this report.

Trip Generation

Table B-4 presents the project’s trip generation and compares the trips generated to the assumptions in the SPASP FEIR. Using the same trip generation methodology used in the SPASP FEIR, it is estimated that the project would generate about 17 AM peak-hour and 32 PM peak-hour trips.
Table B-4
Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Mid-Rise</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments (#223)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(#820)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Trip Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donut Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Trip Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Project Trip Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a. KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit
b. ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP FEIR trip generation methodology. AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.26 trips per DU (31 percent in, 69 percent out) PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.34 trips per DU (58 percent in, 42 percent out)
c. ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 820 (shopping center), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP FEIR trip generation methodology. AM Peak Hour Average Rate = 0.84 trips per KSF (62 percent in, 38 percent out) PM Peak Hour Average Rate = 3.26 trips per KSF (48 percent in, 52 percent out)

The SPASP FEIR assumed developments at planned/entitled and high priority opportunity sites as part of the traffic analysis for the EIR. Although the project is within the SPASP area, it was not included as a planned/entitled project or priority opportunity site as part of the EIR traffic analysis. However, this analysis compares the project to the high priority opportunity sites analyzed in the EIR to ensure the project does not exceed the total assumptions made for the SPASP area. Since the certification of the SPASP FEIR, four developments, including this project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the City’s approval process. The four developments combined would generate about 26 morning and 47 evening net new peak-hour trips. The combined trip generation is less than the total trip generation estimated for all the opportunity sites in the SPASP FEIR.

As uses proposed by the project are consistent with the assumptions in the SPASP FEIR and the project would generate fewer automobile trips than assumed in the SPASP FEIR, the project would not result in additional impacts on traffic operations at the intersections analyzed in the SPASP FEIR.

Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation

Residents would access the site through a full-access driveway on Jefferson Avenue, about 130 feet west of San Pablo Avenue. The driveway would provide access to a secured parking garage. Section 2.04.02.02 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires two-way driveways for...
buildings on corner lots of community streets to be no wider than 20 feet and located along the adjacent side street. San Pablo Avenue in the project vicinity is classified as a community street. The proposed driveway has a width of 20 feet, which meets the Form-Based Code requirements.

**Project Driveway Site Distance**

The driveway on Jefferson Avenue would provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Vehicles parked on Jefferson Avenue on both sides of the driveway may block sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on Jefferson Avenue. Trees planted on both sides of the driveway may also affect visibility of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than 6 feet from the ground. The project would paint 10 feet of red curb on both sides of the driveway to ensure adequate sight distance.

**Bicycle Parking, Access, and On-Site Circulation**

Per the requirements of the Form-Based Code, the project would require 76 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 6 short-term spaces. As proposed, the project meets those requirements.

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses. As described on page A-19, access to long-term bicycle parking would be located along the exterior of the building through side gates located on Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. Bike storage in the garage would be accessible through the lobby or the garage entrance. Short-term parking would be located along the building frontage on both Jefferson Avenue and San Pablo Avenue. One bicycle stall would be located along Jefferson Avenue, and two bicycle stalls would be located along San Pablo Avenue to accommodate a total of six short-term parking spaces.

**Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation**

Pedestrian access to the residences would be provided through a staircase and elevator in the building lobby and a staircase in the garage. The building lobby would be accessible through the main entrance on Jefferson Avenue, through the project garage, and through the walkway on the south side of the site. The commercial component of the project would be accessible through an entrance along San Pablo Avenue.

The SPASP Form-Based Code (Section 2.04.02) requires a minimum of 14 feet of sidewalk space along community streets: 8 feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and 6 feet of amenity space, which includes landscaping. For neighborhood streets, the Form-Based Code requires a minimum of 10 feet of sidewalk space: 5 feet of clear pedestrian right-of-way and 5 feet of amenity space. The project would include 14-foot sidewalk widths along San Pablo Avenue, a community street, and 10-foot sidewalk widths along Jefferson Avenue, a neighborhood street, which would meet code requirements for total sidewalk width. The project would also provide 8 feet and 5 feet of pedestrian right-of-way along San Pablo Avenue and Jefferson Avenue, respectively, which would meet code requirements.

**Transit Access**

AC Transit provides nearby transit service to the project site with a bus stop on southbound San Pablo Avenue, at the near side of the San Pablo Avenue/Jefferson Avenue intersection (just north of Jefferson).

**Vehicle Parking and TDM Requirements**
The project would provide a secured parking garage with a two-way drive aisle and a total of 34 spaces, including 31 double-lift parking spaces, 1 surface space, and 2 ADA spaces. The surface parking space dimensions are approximately 9 feet in width and 18 feet in length, meeting Form-Based Code requirements for perpendicular parking spaces.

TOMIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) requires a maximum of 1.5 automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit. There is no required parking for commercial spaces less than 3,000 square feet. For projects proposing a residential parking ratio between zero and one space per unit, additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures and a parking study are required.

Table B-5 summarizes the required and proposed parking for the project. The Form-Based Code would limit parking to a maximum of 75 off-street residential parking spaces for the project. The project would provide 34 spaces (corresponding to 1.4 spaces per unit) and is therefore within the allowable number of parking spaces for TOMIMU residential developments.

Section 2.05.07.07 of the Form-Based Code requires that at least 10 percent of the total number of parking spaces provided for a multifamily residential project be pre-wired to allow for electric vehicle (EV) charging, with at least one space being an accessible parking space. The site plan designates three parking spaces as pre-wired to accommodate EV charging, one of which is an accessible space, which would meet code requirements. An additional parking space is designated as a run conduit for a future EV station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Required Parking Supply</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>50 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2.9 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Supply Ratio (spaces/unit)** 0.68


Notes:
-- DU = dwelling units; KSF = 1,000 square feet
-- The project is not required to provide commercial parking spaces, as the proposed commercial space is less than 3,000 square feet.
-- Source: SPASP Form-Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 – TOMIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential; Max 1.5 spaces per DU

The project would be required to implement a basic TDM plan. The project proposes the following TDM strategies that would reduce automobile trips and parking demand generated by the project:

The Plan requires additional TDM measures consisting of: 1) subsidizing the purchase of Clipper Cards for each residential unit of the proposed building for one year. The subsidy is to be $3.00 per day per residential unit; and 2) designating the building management as the TDM Coordinator for the building; and 3) creating TDM marketing materials and providing tenant education on transportation options. These options include providing user focused maps, additional information about transit fare discounts, car and ride sharing options, carpool opportunities, and events that are focused on walking and bicycling.
Applicable Mitigation

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in new impacts related to transportation. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the transportation impacts of the project, and no new impacts related to transportation would result.

Conclusion

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts. With implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval, no new impacts related to transportation would result.
### XVII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this document, Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project. This mitigation measure would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

In addition, subsequent to certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which provides for consultation between lead agencies and Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process. Effective July 1, 2015, AB 52 states that prior to the release of an EIR or negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because (a) this checklist supports the findings that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162; (b) no new or substantially more severe significant effects could occur under the project; (c) no new mitigation measures would be required; (d) the project is within the scope of the environmental review of the SPASP FEIR; and (e) no further review under CEQA is required, the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for this project. However, as stated above, SPASP FEIR Mitigation Measure 7-2 applies to the project and would protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

**Applicable Mitigation**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the potential cultural resources impacts (and by extension, impacts on tribal cultural resources) of the project, and no new impacts would result.
**Environmental Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand, in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Existing water utility infrastructure is present along San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site. There is an existing lateral service near the southwest corner of the property. Existing sewer mains are present along San Pablo Avenue. Estimated domestic water consumption on the project site is 6,000 gallons per day (gpd). Wastewater generation based on project conditions would be 5,300 gpd.

The SPASP FEIR determined that there would be an increase in water demand as a result of buildout of the SPASP; average daily demand would be 882,720 gallons gpd, which represents less than 1 percent of the planning level water demand forecast in the Urban Water Management Plan. The SPASP FEIR concluded that this represents a small increase and would be a less than significant impact on water supply. The SPASP FEIR also noted that development within the SPASP area would incorporate the City’s requirements for adequate water supply, including compliance with adopted performance standards; application of these standards in each jurisdictional City’s development review process; coordination of development review with EBMUD (including consistency with the Urban Water Management Plan); and the requirement that new development pay its share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities through project-specific mitigation required as conditions of approval. The SPASP FEIR concluded that since future development facilitated by the SPASP, including the project, would require less than 1 percent of EBMUD’s forecast planning-level water demand for its service area.
by the year 2040, and would be subject to EBMUD and jurisdictional City plans, regulations, and ordinances regarding water supply, the impact on water supply would be less than significant.

The SPASP FEIR concluded that development associated with the SPASP would result in less than significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that the wastewater and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, to accommodate new development facilitated by the SPASP. The SPASP FEIR included recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements.

The project would rely on potable and nonpotable water for both domestic use and fire protection from existing major facilities, including reservoirs and pumping plants which are serviced by EBMUD. Service would be granted subject to EBMUD regulations governing water services, which may include water main extensions and/or off-site pipeline improvements.

Construction of the project-related utility infrastructure would be temporary and would occur within existing public rights-of-way, City property, a project development site, or private property subject to a municipal easement.

The Stege Sanitary District (SSD) provides wastewater service to businesses along San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. Wastewater generated at the project site would be collected via an 18-inch collector main along Potrero Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Potrero Avenue and Schmidt Lane. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, a district-wide per fixture sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge is required to be paid by new development to the district. The connection/capacity charge funds sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP.

Currently the SSD imposes a sewer connection charge on all development projects within its service territory. The purpose of the charge is to have new development buy into a fair share of the district’s existing sanitary sewer system. The SSD uses these funds to acquire, construct, install, and replace existing capital facilities and other assets.

In September 2017, a special study was completed to help plan for future developments in the SPASP. Without pipe upsizing, the anticipated development in the SPASP would surcharge existing facilities. An additional capacity charge will fund sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPASP. For new connections and increased discharges in the SPASP, both residential and nonresidential developments will pay $217.89 per fixture unit over and above district-wide sewer connection and capacity fees for existing structures.

The SSD may also may require that larger projects within its service territory analyze capacity impacts on the existing sanitary sewer system. Larger development projects include:

---

44 Based on the SSD’s estimate that a dwelling unit generates on average 143 gallons per day (Urban Economics 2017).
• 10 housing units
• a minimum of 10,000 square feet of commercial space
• 1,000 square feet of restaurant space

Based on these criteria, the project would be categorized as a large development project because it would build more than 10 residential units. The developer would also submit a sewer capacity plan to the City for approval.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the SPASP would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the SPASP area. The SPASP FEIR concluded that the increase in solid waste generation would be incremental but would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulations. Moreover, the projected solid waste would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient capacities to accommodate development included as part of the SPASP, including the project. As such, solid waste impacts would remain less than significant.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the SPASP FEIR and would be generally consistent with the development standards envisioned in the SPASP FEIR. With implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, the project would not result in new impacts related to utilities and service systems. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the project, and no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.

**Conclusion**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, nor revisions to the project, nor new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified leading to new or more severe significant impacts, and with implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, no new impacts related to utilities and service systems would result.
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Design Review comments

City of Richmond, Design Review Chair.

Comment One:

Thank you!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! We need this! Nice design overall, just a few comments. This is another great example of a FBC document that works. I wish Richmond's was up and running.

OK, some less flowery comments

1. Landscaping on Jefferson ......It is a nice idealistic vision to have provided a bocce court for the public on Jefferson, however this idea is most likely going to be a future nuisance and look like a run-down weed trap in the years to come. The sidewalk is very wide here and there is no commercial use adjacent to this wide sidewalk. I would suggest using the par-course rec station, the bocce court as landscape space to soften the towering mass above Jefferson. I would also suggest that the sidewalk be limited to 6 feet of travel and the rest dedicated to landscaping. Again, way too much hardscape in relation to the vertical mass. Remember the design must transition to the grain and scale of Single Family low density on Jefferson....

2. Worried about the harsh stucco wall adjacent to the two story apartment building to the West. This is an unbroken unarticulated mass of concrete with no vines intended to grow to soften this after-thought of the building design. Suggest pulling the building away from the PL 6'' and then adding a vine espalier to this west face...plants will thrive in the warm afternoon sun there and soften the harsh wall of concrete that the residents of the apartment house get to look at.
3. I would not be opposed to seeing a change of roof height on the back section of this design. Use the artful roof overhang of the San Pablo Ave façade and use it to help shade and reduce the bulk on the North, West and South sections of this design. The box like forms do not relate to the needed shade functions. To boxy and unarticulated

4. The art / entry structure needs to be a warmer, more organic and of human scale design. Steel and polycarbonate is cold and unwelcoming....try using the IPE wood that is shown on the balconies in lieu of the proposed very urban but interesting entry....This may work in Emeryville, but not so much on Jefferson.

5. West façade – needs help...needs warmth

6. All LED lighting needs to be 2500-3000K max! all lighting on the face of the building shall be indirect – either up or down lights.

Cheers

Jonathan
February 5, 2018

Melanie Mintz, Community Development Director  
El Corrito Planning Department  
10890 San Pablo Avenue  
El Cerrito, CA 94530  

RE 10903 San Pablo Ave, southwest corner of Jefferson Ave. (Playland-Not-at-the-Beach and Donut Shop); proposed 50-unit high density mixed-use development; 65 off-street parking spaces; 57' to top of parapet  
10919 San Pablo Ave, southwest corner of Alameda Ave. (Marty's Motors and Conners Overhead Door Co.); proposed 85-unit high density mixed-use development; 42 off-street parking spaces; 57' to top of parapet

Dear Ms. Mintz:

The Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council is in review of the above-titled building projects. Listed below are some of our recommendations:

1. For a thorough and comprehensive plan review, please include the following items for these two building projects, which is common practice of other cities reviewing large scale projects:

Site Plan
- Show the property lines and indicate the lot dimensions on the plans.
- Show dimensioned setbacks, including front setback, side yard setbacks on both sides, and most importantly the rear yard setback and the side setbacks of the abutting residential rear building(s) and indicate the number(s) on the plans.
- Show any portions of neighboring buildings within 100 feet of subject property, including the rear properties.
- Show driveways and parking spaces with dimensions.

Building Elevations
- Show the profiles of adjacent buildings that show the full outline of abutting homes and/or apartment buildings within 100 feet of subject property and indicate their elevations on the plans.
- Side elevations should show full profile of the adjacent building and window openings that face the project.

Parking Survey
- Parking evaluation for projects requesting a waiver of any parking required under the ZO.

Photo Simulations for Large Scale Development Projects
- Photo simulations for large scale development projects. Show site before and after project, from at least 4 angles that demonstrate maximum impact on views from surrounding properties; also show adjacent properties that surround the development project, including the rear single-family and/or apartment buildings within 100 feet.

Traffic Impact Analysis
- For projects creating 10 or more dwelling units, 5,000 SQF or more of gross floor area, or 25 peak hour or more vehicle trips (based on ITE generation rates)
2. Stepbacks

We recommend stepbacks, as shown below in the Berkeley example on San Pablo Avenue at the corner of Delaware Street.

San Pablo Ave.

Delaware St.

1800 San Pablo Avenue, corner of Delaware, Berkeley. Delaware Street Elevation. "Delaware Court is a four story, 51 unit, mixed-use project in Berkeley, California. In addition to the 51 units above the podium, this .46 acre (20,037.6 square feet) site incorporates 9,500 square feet of retail and parking for 50 cars on three tier parking lifts. Delaware Court is to be the first new building on San Pablo Avenue in what will be the revitalization of the West Berkeley/San Pablo Avenue corridor. Delaware Court makes the transition from a commercial street to a residential neighborhood by borrowing materials and details from the Bungalow style architecture of the adjacent homes and incorporating them into the elevations of the building. Significant stepping of the elevations and setbacks along Delaware add to the transition from commercial to the single family homes," as described in HDO Architects/Planners' portfolio. Delaware Court was developed by Said Adeli.

These stepbacks were achieved, based on West Berkeley's Physical Form Policy 4.2: The physical form should use tools such as increased building setbacks or upper story stepbacks to reduce the impacts of differences in scale, style, and site plan.

The El Cerrito daylight plane is not favored and does not kick in until after the building is 35 feet.

Under the Albany 2035 General Plan, adopted April 18, 2016, their daylight plane provision is a lot better and their building height limit for San Pablo Avenue is reasonable. A 38-foot height limit applies, although a height bonus may be considered. Zoning overlay districts may apply within their area to particular General Plan objectives, such as reducing impacts on nearby residential uses and creating "nodes" at key locations. For parcels on San Pablo Avenue in Altany,
the regulation means that the 38 foot height limit can only be achieved on a portion of each property, since that limit becomes gradually lower toward the rear of the lot. The maximum height at a distance of 15 feet from the rear property line is 20 feet. Their zoning regulations include additional information on how daylight plane is calculated, and what the regulations are in different zones.

**RANC Recommendations:** We recommend stepbacks to break up the building forms from the rear of the proposed buildings, where Richmond Annex low-density residential neighborhoods exist. Lower the building height from 57' to 42'. We believe the height at the roof ridge line of the Village at Town Center Apartments, 10810 San Pablo Avenue at Schmidt Lane would be more appropriate for this particular location. (On page 4 of 4, please see the Building Height Perspectives, showing the Village at Town Center Apts.)

3. Parking

The building project at 1800 San Pablo Avenue at the corner of Delaware Street in Berkeley did not dramatically reduce the required number of parking spaces, due to the fact that the building abuts a low density residentially-zoned district. The Delaware units provided at least one parking space per unit.

**RANC Recommendations:**

a. In this case, the Alameda and Jefferson Building Projects abut a residentially-zoned district in Richmond Annex. Therefore, the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council recommends that the Alameda Building Project provide at least one parking space per unit. If not provided, a project of this magnitude (85-units) will assuredly create parking spill over into adjacent neighborhoods and create severe parking conflicts on Alameda Avenue and the surrounding residential streets.

b. Carefully distinguish the difference between an intensive business use with higher parking demands and a low-volume use. Ensure there is adequate off-street parking for intensive retail business (employees and customers) to prevent parking conflicts in Richmond Annex residential neighborhoods.

c. In our experience, guest parking is key in making this type of project successful. At least 1 space per every 10-units would be appropriate. Friends and relatives will be visiting the tenants all the time, especially during the evenings and on the weekends.

In summation, the proposed projects would be overbuilt for the lots and show a major disregard of our neighborhoods. We would like to ensure that the new building projects are designed to minimize sharp contrasts in height. As proposed now, the dramatic height in relationship to our low-density residential neighborhood would make us feel enclosed—i.e. visually blocked off like inside a fort. Furthermore, our residential neighborhood would be used as a parking lot, due to the dramatic reduction in off-street parking. If the two projects were redesigned with our recommended modifications, we believe it would lead to a quality development which would be a better fit and more harmonious with the Richmond Annex side of San Pablo Avenue.

We would like to work with you to effect a compatible design. Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Selva,
President
510-375-7769

Cc: El Cerrito Design Review Board members

Attachment: Building Height Perspectives
Building Height Perspectives
As verified with city records; building heights as measured from grade to roof ridgeline

The Vital Building (formerly E.C. Mill & Lumber Building)
10837 San Pablo at Orchard Ave., Richmond Annex
Building height: 25 ft., as verified with City records.

The Village at Town Center (mixed-use building)
10810 San Pablo at Schmidt Lane, El Cerrito
Building height: 42 ft., as verified with City records.

Del Norte Place (mixed-use building)
11720 San Pablo at Knott Ave., El Cerrito
Building height: 45 ft., as verified with City records.

Eskaton Hazel Shirley Manor* (senior housing)
11025 San Pablo at Madison Ave., El Cerrito
Building height: 40 ft., as verified with City records.

1885 University at MLK, Berkeley (Trader Joe's mixed-use building) Building height: 50 ft. for main building; 54 feet to top of penthouses, as verified with City records.
Fax 5 pages

Design Review Board

C/o Planning Division

City of El Cerrito

Written comments for
April 4th meeting of board

Blair Akey
March 13, 2017

Concerns Regarding the Construction of San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA.

1. Property lines: My understanding is that the property line between lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. and lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. extends southward to within three inches from the south wall of the existing building which is to be demolished. The west boundary line of lot 10945 San Pablo Ave., which runs north to south will extend to and intersect the south property line between lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. & lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. which runs east to west.

2. Fencing: Your plans indicate a six foot wood fence partially along the south boundary line as described in paragraph 1. It is requested that a prefabricated eight foot wood fence, seven feet in height minimum, be constructed along the entire length of the property line as described in paragraph 1. The requested fence will provide better security and sound control between the two properties. An access gate set back from San Pablo Ave. along your south property line will provide a living space between the two properties for street people who frequent San Pablo Ave.

3. Trees planted along the south property as described in paragraph 1 could prove to be a maintenance problem depending upon the type of tree selected and how they are planted. If the trees are deciduous or have surface feeding root systems removal of leaves in the fall and heaving of concrete will have to be addressed. One cubic yard of waste removal per week by East Bay Sanitary cost about $78.00. I would request that Italian Cypress trees be planted with root retainers if necessary.

4. Security: Security by means of fencing and possibly Security Patrol will have to be maintained during the construction process. Removal of the structure on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. will obviate the present security for lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. Building a permanent fence as soon as practical along southern boundary line as described in paragraph 1 is requested. During the construction of the El Cerrito Village Apartments there was intrusion of street people at night and theft of property even though there was temporary fencing of the entire property.

5. Drainage: The Grant Deed for lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. provides for permanent drainage of surface water from said lot onto the lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. There are presently two out falls for surface water. This right will have to be addressed.

6. Parking: Present parking in and around existing apartments in the area is impacted by sheer demand and limited space. A reduction in parking spaces required per apartment for new construction by the City of El Cerrito has made a bad problem even worse. The city does not consistently enforce its parking regulations and commercial businesses on San Pablo Ave. who need available street parking to attract and retain a customer base are unfavorably impacted. Additional off street parking at a minimum of one parking space per unit of rental is requested.

7. Noise and Dust Control: Demolition and construction on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. will by its very nature generate dust and noise in close proximity to existing living structures consisting of 2 apartments...
of 28 units and 2 homes. Please provide a specific plan of action and control measures which will be taken and monitored during the entire construction process to ensure that people residing in adjacent buildings will not in any manner be harmed or exposed to elements that will cause any type of physical injury to people or personal property.

8. Hours of Construction: Hours of construction consistent with present laws and regulations are requested to be strictly observed and monitored for compliance during the entire time that construction is undertaken on lot 10963 San Pablo Ave.

Copy to:
Wang Brothers Investments, LLC Representative

Blair Akey 3/15/18
March 15, 2017

Blair Akey
P.O. Box 11
Alamo, CA 94507

Design Review Board
c/o Planning Division
City of El Cerrito
10890 San Pablo Ave.
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Reference Application: PL17-0084

Dear Sir:

Enclosed are a letter and a list of concerns which I discussed with Mr. Kevin Wang, developer of the proposed San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave.

I am the owner of the property, El Cerrito Village Apartments, 10945 San Pablo Ave., directly south of lot 10963 San Pablo Ave.

It is requested that a copy of the enclosures be given to each member of the Design Review Board in preparation for the Board’s scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 4, 2018.

Although Mr. Wang & I have discussed the concerns and I have sent the letter requesting the fencing there has been no written agreement on anything.

It is requested that the enclosures become part of the official record of the Board’s meeting on April 4, 2018.

I plan to attend the April 4th meeting.

Yours truly,

Blair Akey

Cc: Concerns Regarding the Construction of San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave. March 13, 2018
Letter dated March 15, 2019 requesting fencing for San Pablo Apartments, 10963 San Pablo Ave.
March 15, 2018

Blair Akey
P.O. Box 11
Alamo, CA 94507

Mr. Kevin Wang:
Wang Brothers Investments, LLC
1 Bates Blvd.
Suite # 400
Orinda, CA, 94563

Dear Mr. Wang:

Thank you for the recent meeting we had last Tuesday concerning the development of your property located at 10963 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA.

After giving the proposed fencing for lot 10963 San Pablo Ave. some thought I am requesting that the fence to be constructed be entirely on your property, that it be a minimum of 7 feet in height and be made of materials identical to that which is specified for the fencing for your development at 10919 San Pablo Ave., El Cerrito, CA, The Alameda Apartments.

Having the requested fencing would greatly enhance the appearance of the San Pablo Apartments, and provide for better security and sound control.

By having the fence constructed entirely on your property it establishes clear ownership of the fence and the exact property line between the two lots, 10945 & 10963 San Pablo Ave.

Your previous proposal of utilizing the existing fence allows for a small portion of land belonging to lot 10945 San Pablo Ave. on the north side of the existing fence.

I am most desirous that there be no impediment to the future sale of my property created by my land being on the north side of the existing fence which in itself overtime may dispute as to who in fact legally owns the land.

I can appreciate your desire to utilize the existing fencing but given the above reasons long term the requested fencing should prove to be mutually beneficial and in both parties best interest.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Blair Akey

cc: City of El Cerrito, Design Review Board
PER FORM BASED CODE SECTION 2.05.02.02.05 BUILDINGS ALONG NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS (JEFFERSON AVE) WITH MIXED USES SHALL NOT CAST SHADOWS BEYOND THE CURB LINE ON THEoppPrime SIA SIDE OF A STREET NORTH OF THE SITE AT 4 PM ON THE WINTER SOLSTICE (DEC 21).

PER FORM BASED CODE SECTION 2.05.02.02.04 BUILDINGS ALONG MAJOR COMMERCIAL STREETS (SAN PABLO AVE) SHALL NOT CAST SHADOWS BEYOND THE CURB LINE ON THE OPPPOSITE SIDE OF A STREET EAST OF THE SITE AT 1:30 PM ON THE WINTER SOLSTICE (DEC 21).
GROUND FLOOR
NON-RESIDENTIAL:
TOTAL AREA: 1,395 SF
OPEN AREA: 1,112 SF
TRANSPARENCY: 80% (75% MIN REQ'D)

UPPER FLOORS:
TOTAL AREA: 3,642 SF
OPEN AREA: 1,748 SF
TRANSPARENCY: 48% (30% MIN REQ'D)

GROUND FLOOR
RESIDENTIAL:
TOTAL AREA: 2,135 SF
OPEN AREA: 660 SF
TRANSPARENCY: 31% (30% MIN REQ'D)

JEFFERSON TRANSPARENCY

SAN PABLO TRANSPARENCY

SAN PABLO APARTMENTS
10963 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA

1/8" = 1'-0"
SAN PABLO AVENUE

JEFFERSON AVENUE

PROTECT WATERMETER, ADJUST TO FINISHED GRADE
16.0'
2.0'
17.9'

PROTECT CLEAN OUT, ADJUST TO FINISHED GRADE

PROTECT WATERMETER, ADJUST TO FINISHED GRADE

PROTECT ELECTRICAL BOX, ADJUST TO FINISHED GRADE

PROTECT STREETSIGN, ADJUST TO FINISHED GRADE

REMOVE GAS METER
REMOVESIGN, POLE AND FOUNDATION AND REINSTALL ADJACENT TO NEW DRIVEWAY

PROTECT COMM BOX

ABBREVIATIONS

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF CURB UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLANS
2. UTILITIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN SET ARE DERIVED FROM RECORD DATA AND/OR SURFACE OBSERVATIONS TOGETHER WITH THE PRESENCE OF ANY ADDITIONAL UTILITY LINES NOT SHOWN ON THIS PLAN SHALL BE VERIFIED IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
3. PRIOR TO DIGGING, CALL 811 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE TO HAVE EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES MARKED.
4. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED CONTRACTORS SHALL PROTECT ALL EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS.
5. LIMIT OF SIDEWALK REMOVAL SHALL BE TO THE NEAREST SCORE JOINT.
6. ALL SURFACE IMPROVEMENTS (ASPHALT, CONCRETE, SIDEWALK, ETC.) WITHIN THE LIMIT OF DEMOLITION ARE TO BE REMOVED EXCEPT SOD, VEGETATION, AND LANDSCAPE.

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY AND BOUNDARY

THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND BOUNDARY DATA SHOWN ON THESE PLANS IS FIRMLY BELIEVED TO BE CORRECT. REVISIONS OR ADDITIONS TO THESE PLANS ARE TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ERECTION OF THE STRUCTURE OR INSTALLATION OF THE IMPROVEMENTS.

ISSUEDATE: 02/27/2018
CHECKED BY: J. WHITE
DRAWN BY: M. THOMAS

PROPERTIES
The proposed mixed use development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito will create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impermeable surface. Therefore, this project will be subject to coverage under the provisions of the California Regional Storm Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Regional Watershed Management Program (SF Bay RWQCB) and will be reviewed in accordance with the California Regional Watershed Management Program.

**Stormwater Management Notes:**
- See plumbing plans for details.
- BMPs on ground level to be determined by MEP.
- See plumbing plans for details.

**General Notes:**
- Storm drain routing of BMP 2 on second floor to be determined by MEP. See plumbing plans for details.
- See plumbing plans for details.

**Abbreviations:**
- BMP: Best Management Practice
- CONC: Concrete
- GND: Ground
- LID: Low Impact Development
- LVS: Levee
- RF: Roof
- SFS: Square Feet

**Drainage Management Area Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1A</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1B</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1C</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA-1D</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>6,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>10,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed mixed use development at 10963 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito will create or replace more than 10,000 square feet of impermeable surface. Therefore, this project will be subject to coverage under the provisions of the California Regional Storm Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Regional Watershed Management Program.

**Legend:**
- Flow Through Planter
- Landscape Area
- Permeable Surface
- Sub-Drainage Management Area
- Property Line

**Stormwater Control Plan**

**Project #:** KWP01

**Issued Date:** 02/27/2018

**Checked by:** J. White

**Drawn by:** M. Thomas

**Entitlements/Design Review:**

**Address:**
1810 Sixth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710

**Phone:** 510.841.3555 Fax: 510.841.1225

**StudiokDA.com**
1. Cleanout pipes shall be same size and material as underdrain pipe.
2. Locking mechanisms shall be tamper resistant and flanged or accessible in use.
3. Cleanout shall be installed to allow for maintenance access to all pipes.
4. All fittings shall be soil tight.
5. Minimum streamed cobble diameters shall be larger than max grate openings.

**CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**INLET PROTECTION**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**FIBER ROLL**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**STORM AND SEWER CLEANOUT**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**STORMDRAIN OVERFLOW STRUCTURE**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**UNDERDRAINS**

**NOT TO SCALE**

**FLOW THROUGH PLANTER CLEANOUT**

**NOT TO SCALE**
LEGEND

SYM      DESCRIPTION

DECKING:

SEE ARCH DWGS

SEE SHEET L204 AND L205 FOR PLANT SCHEDULE AND IMAGES
GROUND LEVEL PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>CRIBOGIO XELOI &quot;AUTUMN GOLD&quot;</td>
<td>NAUCK 1000 TREE</td>
<td>TRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2&quot; BOX</td>
<td>30 X 30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>ALMIRAL A 16 BK 80 APRICOT TRUNK</td>
<td>ALMIRAL A 16 BK 80 APRICOT TRUNK</td>
<td>DBR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 GALLON</td>
<td>40 X 30</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>PODOCARPS GRACILLOR</td>
<td>FERPIVAE</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>PHMDIAZ PIA &quot;BLACK JESTER&quot;</td>
<td>NEW ZEALAND FLY</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>BUXINE PLUTROZEE &quot;SWANAGE&quot;</td>
<td>BUXINE</td>
<td>BUX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>CIANTER CRASSLA</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>CRASS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>LA ANABRA LONGFILA &quot;SHEEZ&quot;</td>
<td>MARRUSH</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PATHPOSOCUS TR CUSPDATA</td>
<td>BOSTON FLY</td>
<td>VINE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 GALLON</td>
<td>20 X 20</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* STREET TREE CAUTER TO BE A MINIMUM 2.5" DBH AND EXHIBIT TRUE TAPER.

GROUND LEVEL FLOW-THROUGH PLANTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>PHBBULA A 8 GAL FORMIC &quot;MILD GLOD BRIND&quot;</td>
<td>DIWARY COFFEBERRY</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>CAMBRIA 25 GALL</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>MAXILLA XIBELS &quot;SWIFT&quot;</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMJ</td>
<td>MAJ-LBREEB 15 GALL</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>SAMBUCUS ACR &quot;BLACK BEAUTY&quot;</td>
<td>BLACK BEARDBEERRY</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMJ</td>
<td>MAXILLA MILLBOLJU &quot;TEA COTTON&quot;</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND FLOOR FLOW-THROUGH PLANTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>PHBBULA A 8 GAL FORMIC &quot;MILD GLOD BRIND&quot;</td>
<td>DIWARY COFFEBERRY</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MAJ-LBREEB 15 GALL</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>SAMBUCUS NIGRA &quot;BLACK BEAUTY&quot;</td>
<td>BLACK BEARDBEERRY</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>ACJ-LBREEB MILLJU &quot;TEA COTTON&quot;</td>
<td>BORELEY BUDGE</td>
<td>SHRIB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>62 X 62</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROOF DECK PLANTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QU</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT X WIDTH</th>
<th>WATER USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>BARBELA MULTILIPLEX &quot;SOLID GODDESS&quot;</td>
<td>GOLDEN GODDESS BANBIO</td>
<td>BARBIO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>6 X 6</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MML</td>
<td>MACRANHOURS &quot;MORNING LIGHT&quot;</td>
<td>MAEKENHURM GRASS</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
<td>6 X 6</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUND LEVEL PLANTING

GB - GINKGO
PG - PODOCARPUS
CD - CAREX DIVULSA
PT - PARTHENOCISSUS
PB - PHORMIUM 'BLACK ADDER'
BF - BULBINE 'ORANGE'
LB - LOMANDRA 'BREEZE'
AR - ACER 'ARMSTRONG'

FLOW-THROUGH PLANTERS

MM - MAHONIA 'CHARITY'
CD - CAREX DIVULSA
FC - FRANGULA
AM - ACHILLEA
MR - MUHLENBERGIA RIGENS
SN - SAMBUCUS

ROOF DECKS

BM - BAMBOO
MM - MISCANTHUS
JEFFERSON AVENUE

SAN PABLO AVENUE

COORDINATION LEGEND

- Copper Pipe Penetration: All copper pipe in structure shall be routed, supplied, and installed by the plumbing contractor. See X on plan.
- Electrical Conduit Penetration: All conduit in structure shall be routed, supplied, and installed by the electrical contractor. See O on plan.
- Structure Opening: Electrical conduit from controller to remote penetration.

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.
NOTE:
REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>COPPER PIPE PENETRATION. ALL COPPER PIPE IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>IN-STRUCTURE BRANCHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONDUIT FROM CONTROLLER TO REMOTE PENETRATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAN PABLO
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EL CERRITO, CA

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.
COORDINATION LEGEND

NOTE:
REFER TO SHEET L304 FOR IRRIGATION LEGEND SHOWING ALL EQUIPMENT SYMBOLS AND DESCRIPTIONS.

SYMBOL | DESCRIPTION
--- | ---
○ | COPPER PIPE PENETRATION. ALL COPPER PIPE IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
■ | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
| | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
| | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.
| | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT PENETRATION. ALL CONDUIT IN STRUCTURE SHALL BE ROUTED, SUPPLIED, AND INSTALLED BY THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR. SIZE AS NOTED ON PLANS.

NOTE: IN STRUCTURE MAINLINE AND ELECTRICAL CONDUIT LINES ARE SHOWN FOR CLARITY ONLY. ALL IN STRUCTURE PIPING SHALL BE ROUTED BY THE PLUMBING OR ELECTRICAL ENGINEER.
NOTES

02/15/2018
75% DD

PROJECT ISSUE REVIEW:

7. SHALL BE AN EQUAL DISTANCE FROM THE WALK, CURB, ETC. AND EACH BOX SHALL BE INSTALL VALVE BOXES MINIMUM 12" FROM AND PERPENDICULAR TO WALK, CURB, KEYS TO CONTROLLER CABINETS.

10. WIRES. LOOP 36" EXCESS WIRE INTO EACH SINGLE VALVE BOX AND INTO ONE VALVE COMPLETE AND DATED MANUFACTURER'S WARRANTIES.

12. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY REMOTE AND WEATHER SENSOR RECEPTION TO THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO INSTALLING THE CONTROLLER. IF SIGNAL IS TOO WEAK, EXTEND #14, U.L. APPROVED FOR DIRECT BURIAL. COMMON WIRE SHALL BE #12 U.L. APPROVED PVC SOLVENT WELD FITTINGS. 12" COVER.

13. OWNER WITH A MAINTENANCE MANUAL. DATA SHALL BE ON 8 1/2" X 11" SHEETS, IN A ANY EXCAVATION.

15. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE A DRIP EMITTER SYSTEM FOR ALL TREES, SHRUBS, AND GROUNDCOVER AS INDICATED ON THE IRRIGATION PLAN AND DETAILS.

16. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

17. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

18. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

19. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

20. LOUICE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

21. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

22. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

23. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

24. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

25. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.

26. LOCATE QUICK COUPLING VALVE 12" FROM HARDSCAPE AREA.
NOT TO SCALE

23
22
21

E-MAIL BROOKWATER@BROOKWATER.COM

PLUMBED TO TUBING

AIR/VACUUM RELIEF LATERAL

L306

TEL 925.855.0417  FAX 925.855.0357

TORO DL2000 AIR/VACUUM RELIEF VALVE - SAN RAMON, CALIFORNIA  94583
IRRIGATION CONSULTANTS

ASSEMBLY.

AIR/VACUUM RELIEF VALVE DETAIL.

AIR/VACUUM RELIEF VALVE CANNOT BE CONNECTED LOWER DRIPLINE TEE FITTING.

HIGH POINT. REFER TO 9.

PVC CROSS (SxSxSxS)

6.

3.

1.

AIR/VACUUM RELIEF LATERAL, DRIPLINE LATERAL.

5.

4.

3.

3.

NOTE:

BLANK POLY TUBING CENTERED BLANK POLY TUBING CENTERED

1/2" POLYETHYLENE TUBING

PVC TEE (SxSxT) WITH 1/2" FPT PVC TEE (SxSxT) WITH 1/2" FPT

FINISH GRADE.

CONVENTIONAL SPACING 25% MORE FINISH GRADE.

PERIMETER LATERAL 2" TO 4" FROM EDGE PERIMETER LATERAL 2" TO 4" FROM EDGE

NOTE:

TOP OF 2" MULCH TOP OF 2" MULCH

1/2" PVC TUBING 1/2" PVC TUBING

NOTE:

TOP OF MULCH TOP OF MULCH

1/2" PVC TUBING 1/2" PVC TUBING

NOTE:

1/2" PVC TUBING 1/2" PVC TUBING

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V

W

X

Y

Z

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.
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EXISTING SOLID WALL AT PROPEERTY-MP ENTRANCE

FLOW THROUGH PLANTER "SAME" (5' X 10') SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS
8 FT WOOD GATE
6 FT WOOD FENCE
6 FT IRON CHAIN LINK FENCE
6 FT WOOD FENCE AND WALL
BIKE PARKING, SEE ARCH DWS
ARTIFICIAL TURF
FLOW THROUGH PLANTER "SAME" (5' X 10') SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS

EXISTING TREE
TO BE REMOVED
PROPOSED TREE
SEE SHEET L201

EXISTING TREE

TREE ID | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | SIZE [DBH] | LOCATION | STATUS | REASON FOR REMOVAL
--------|----------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------|---------------------
#1 CEITIS VARUS | CHINESE HAWKSBERRY | 12" | SIDEWALK JEFFERSON ST (NORTH) | TO BE REMOVED | PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT
#2 UNGULARIS | SWEET GUM | 22" | SIDEWALK JEFFERSON ST (NORTH) | TO BE REMOVED | PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT
#3 CEITIS VARUS | CHINESE HAWKSBERRY | 13" | SIDEWALK PABLO AVE (NORTH) | TO BE REMOVED | PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT
#4 CEITIS VARUS | CHINESE HAWKSBERRY | 12" | SIDEWALK PABLO AVE (NORTH) | TO BE REMOVED | PARTIALLY INSIDE NEW BUILDING FOOTPRINT
#5 PYRUS CALLERYANA | ORNAMENTAL PEAR | 5" | NORTH PROPERTY LINE | TO BE REMOVED | INTERFERES WITH NEW SITEWORK
#6 PYRUS CALLERYANA | ORNAMENTAL PEAR | 5" | NORTH PROPERTY LINE | TO BE REMOVED | INTERFERES WITH NEW SITEWORK
#7 PYRUS CALLERYANA | ORNAMENTAL PEAR | 8" | SOUTH PROPERTY LINE | TO REMAIN | 
#8 PYRUS CALLERYANA | ORNAMENTAL PEAR | 8" | SOUTH PROPERTY LINE | TO REMAIN | 

ENTITLEMENTS / DESIGN REVIEW

PROJECT # 020006
BUILDING 020008
TREE SURVEY

L401
1. **NORTHEAST CORNER** (AS SEEN FROM SAN PABLO)

2. **RESIDENTIAL ENTRANCE**

3. **ROOF DECKS**
SAN PABLO APARTMENTS
10963 SAN PABLO AVE
EL CERRITO, CA

PERSPECTIVE VIEWS

1. EAST FACADE (AS SEEN FROM SAN PABLO)

2. NORTH FACADE (AS SEEN FROM SAN PABLO)

ENTITLEMENTS / DESIGN REVIEW

A212
APPENDICES

http://www.el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/9584