AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, June 6, 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, and John Thompson.

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 May 2, 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 – 10167 San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL17-0006
   Applicant: Charles Oewel
   Location: 10167 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 501-034-003
   Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
   Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 6-story building containing 62 residential units.
   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.
Public Hearing – 10135 San Pablo Avenue
Application: PL16-0005
Applicant: Tom Zhang
Location: 10135 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 510-034-001, and 510-034-002
Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 6-story building containing 72 residential units, 4,435 square feet of ground floor commercial space, and new public open space.
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.

5. Staff Communications

6. Adjournment

Appeals:
A decision of the Design Review Board may be appealed to the Planning Commission, by the applicant or any El Cerrito resident or property owner, through the filing of a written statement and the payment of the applicable appeal fee with the City Clerk within ten calendar days after the decision date. (The applicant may file an appeal for the cost of half the original permit fee.)

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Design Review Board regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Division office located at 10890 San Pablo Avenue during normal business hours.
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, May 2, 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, and John Thompson.

1. Staff Communications
   Glenn Wood has resigned from the Design Review Board.

   Election of Chair, and Vice Chair. Motion to nominate Carl Groch as Chair, Patrick Riley as Vice Chair: Thompson; 2nd Chuaqui.
   Vote:
   Ayes: Chauqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
   Noes: None
   Abstain: None
   Absent: None

2. Comments from the Public
   The following speakers addressed the Board:

   Mary Selva, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council
   Garland Ellis, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council
   Dave Harris, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council

3. Approval of Minutes
   Motion to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2018 meeting: Chuaqui; 2nd Thompson
   Vote:
   Ayes: Chauqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
   Noes: None
   Abstain: None
   Absent: None

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
4. 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.

5. 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.

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

Buddy Williams, applicant and architect for the project, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:

Garland Ellis, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council
Emily Akey, PO Box 11, Alamo, CA
Mary Selva, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council
Howdy Gouday, 635 Elm Street, El Cerrito
Dave Harris, Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council

The public hearing was closed.

The Design Review Board approved the project with Option A for the additional landscaping, and no par course along the Jefferson Avenue elevation.

Motion to approve the project with Option A for the landscaping along Jefferson Avenue: Thompson; 2nd: Chuaqui.
Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None
Public Hearing – 10167 San Pablo Avenue

Application: PL17-0006
Applicant: Charles Oewel
Location: 10167 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 501-034-003
Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)
Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 6-story building containing 62 residential units.

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.

Senior Planner, Sean Moss, presented the staff report and answered questions from the Board.

Joe DeCridico, applicant and architect for the project, presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

The public hearing was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Board:
Howdy Goudey, 635 Elm Street, El Cerrito

The Design Review Board continued the project to June 6, 2018 in order to see the proposed project with the following revisions to the project:

Motion to continue the project to June 6, 2018: Chuaqui; 2nd: Thompson.

Vote:
Ayes: Chuaqui, Groch, Riley, Thompson
Noes: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None

6. Adjournment
9:43pm
DESIGN REVIEW Tier II Staff Report
June 6, 2018
10167 San Pablo Avenue

DETAILS

Application Number: PL17-0006

Applicant: Charles Oewel

Location: 10167 San Pablo Avenue

APN: 501-034-003

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, 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 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 6-story building containing 62 residential units. Thirty-one (31) on-site auto parking spaces are proposed. 93 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 8 short-term bicycle parking spaces are proposed.

The building features a mixture of traditional and contemporary design elements. The ground floor entry for the residential lobby is proposed along San Pablo Avenue. This gate for the parking garage entry integrates public art facing San Pablo Avenue. As exterior materials, the building will utilize dark brown cement fiber siding, and smooth stucco painted brown and rust color. The project will feature aluminum windows throughout.

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 approximately 0.26 acre (11,144 square-feet) and is located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, north of Central Avenue. The project consists of one parcel. The project sits on a mid-block site, with the existing Burger King restaurant to the south and a vacant site to the north which is the site of a proposed development project under a separate application. The project site is generally flat.

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) in the City’s General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The overall site features street frontage on San Pablo Avenue only. The existing San Pablo Avenue frontage is improved with street trees, which are noted on the project plans, and African Iris in the landscape strip adjacent to the curb.

The site is accessible to public transportation and amenities, as south and north bound AC Transit RAPID bus stops are within 300 feet of the project site and on both sides of San Pablo Avenue. In addition, the El Cerrito Plaza BART station is within ½ mile of the site.

Existing/Previous Land Use

The project site comprises the southern portion of a former automotive sales business run by McNevin Cadillac. The former automotive sales business sat on three adjoining parcels. The site for the subject project is the southern most of the three parcels. The site has been vacant for several years. The northern two parcels of the former automotive sales business are the site of a development project proposed by a separate applicant under a separate application.
Adjacent Land Uses

**North**: A vacant site with a submitted application for a project containing 72 dwelling units and 4,435 square feet of retail space.

**East**: Commercial properties along San Pablo Avenue.

**South**: Quick serve restaurant.

**West**: One single family home and one property which appears to contain two residential units.

Analysis

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to construct a new six-story building, consisting of a total of 62 new housing units. The building would feature a residential lobby and building entrance from San Pablo Avenue. A leasing office would also be located on the building frontage. The lobby would contain an elevator, mailboxes and a room for packages. The lobby would lead to a single corridor from which the first floor units would be accessed. The proposed building would feature a below-grade level which would contain
31 auto parking spaces and 93 long term bicycle parking spaces. This parking would be accessed by vehicles via a ramp from San Pablo Avenue and would be accessible to pedestrians via the building elevator. Floors 4-6 of the building would contain common open space in the form of outdoor terraces and a 2,456 square-foot outdoor deck would also be located on the roof.

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 Higher-Intensity Mixed-Use (TOHIMU) 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 section of San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site is designated a Community Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation by Street Type: SPA Commercial Street</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Placement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>7 ft. 10 in.</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>5 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Setback</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>10 ft. (No applicable shadow standard at rear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Access</strong></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 by common entry along the front or side streets.</td>
<td>Residential lobby entry serving all units on San Pablo Avenue; project contains no street-facing units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Access</strong></td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways, minimum 100 feet apart. Side access on corner lots.</td>
<td>1 17 ft. driveway on San Pablo Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Form</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Setbacks</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
<td>14 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>65 ft. along street frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min</td>
<td>80% for Shop Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>30% min</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td>4 ft. max</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Min: 50% Flex</td>
<td>Shop Front (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 50% Forecourt (NE side). Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade (NE side SPA) or Ecofront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Open Space Requirements</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
<th><strong>Provided</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min 62x80=4,960 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,224 sq. ft. provided. Overall surplus for the project of 1,264 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Open Space

| Building for buildings >25,000 sq. ft. (Total of 1,214.08 sq. ft. required) | An in-lieu fee of $123,835.65 will be provided to the City for the public open space. |

Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking</td>
<td>Up to 1.0 spaces/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
<td>0.5 space per unit (total of 31 garage spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Min 1 short-term space/10 units 62/10=6.2 (6) spaces</td>
<td>8 short-term spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min 1.5 long-term spaces/unit 62x1.5=93 spaces</td>
<td>93 long-term spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Height

| Maximum Height | 65 ft. max | 64 ft. |
| Minimum Height | 3 stories residential, 2 stories commercial | 6 residential stories |

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

Design Review Board Comments

The Design Review Board reviewed the project on May 2, 2017 and gave comments to the applicant. The Board then continued the item to the June 6, 2017 meeting.

Comments from the Board and the applicant’s response to those comments are summarized below:
• Comment: Use aluminum windows on the San Pablo Avenue elevation. VPI vinyl windows are acceptable on the remaining elevations.

Response: The plans now call for dark bronze aluminum windows on the San Pablo avenue elevation and vinyl windows on the remaining elevations.

• Comment: Utilize an aluminum curtain wall or aluminum storefront at stairs on the San Pablo Avenue elevation, adjacent to the elevator shaft.

Response: The plans now call for dark bronze aluminum windows at the stairs with aluminum spandrel panels in between.

• Comment: Add more articulation on the north side of the building (min 24” offset suggested).

Response: Additional articulation has been added to the north side of the building. The plans include two projections, each being a minimum of 24 inches.

• Comment: The two exterior brown colors more distinct from each other.

Response: The two brown colors have been changed to more closely match the colors in the rendering. The applicant will have paint samples available at the June 6, 2018 DRB meeting.

• Comment: Add a typical detail cut at the balcony bays.

Response: The applicant will have a detail available at the June 6, 2018 DRB meeting.

• Comment: Explore angling the top of the elevator tower.

Response: The top and side of the elevator tower have been angled to provide visual interest to the building.

In addition to these comments, the landscape plan has been revised to reflect sturdier plants as recommended by the City’s landscape consultant.

Revised Project Rendering
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 metal gate at the entrance to the parking garage on San Pablo Avenue.

Required 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 the applicant is required to pay 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 fees 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 $123,835.65 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 habitable square footage of the project. (48,563 sq. ft. x 5.02= $243,786.26) 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. (62 du x $1,648= $102,176). 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 $469,797.91.

*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.

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 April 11, 2018.
Staff received a voicemail comment from one anonymous citizen. The caller expressed concern about the height of the project being inconsistent with surrounding buildings, the shadows cast by the proposed building, and solar blockage to adjacent properties.

Staff notes that the project is fully complaint with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan in terms of height, and shadow standards.

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 with a building entry 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.*

**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. The project creates a relationship to the street by providing direct pedestrian access from the street to the building.*

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

*The project will provide 62 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The project includes bike parking as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will provide a pleasant pedestrian environment along San Pablo Avenue.*

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.
The project will develop a vacant, underutilized site. The proposed project will provide 62 new residential units in close proximity to public transit along San Pablo Avenue, and in the downtown district.

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

The applicant proposes to add 62 new residential units to a vacant parcel. The project will include public art in the form of a sculptural metal gate at the garage entrance. Private and common open space is proposed with balconies, upper-floor terraces, and a roof deck. The project includes improvements to the streetscape and will contribute toward the complete streets improvements in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

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

The project will provide 62 new residential units by developing a vacant site 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 62 new housing units on San Pablo Avenue with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses. The project includes ground floor residential units.*

**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, by adding additional residential units to the corridor and by developing a vacant site. The location of the project will provide the residents with convenient access to businesses, parks, schools, and public transit.*

**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 El Cerrito Plaza BART station. 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 features pedestrian access to the building lobby from the street. Residential units face San Pablo Avenue 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 will contain a roof deck and several outdoor terraces as common open space for the residents of the project. The roof deck will feature amenities which are functional and desirable, such as a petanque court, for the residents. Many upper-floor units will contain balconies.

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 Manzanita, Cape Rush, Dune Sedge, Spider Plant, Flax, and California Gray Rush.

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 features projections in key locations along the street-facing elevation. The building includes a varied roofline and interesting building form. The building is designed at a human scale with pedestrian building 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 62 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 Avenue and features pedestrian access onto the streets with a main building entrance on San Pablo Avenue, which is served with frequent public transportation.*

**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 Higher-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, CD3.12, 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. PL17-0006, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB18-04 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL17-0006, a project that includes a 6-story residential building containing 62 dwelling units located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period

Within ten (10) calendar 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 Plans, dated May 22, 2018
3. Initial Study Checklist
Design Review Board Resolution DRB 18-04

APPLICATION NO. PL17-0006

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 62 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10167 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 Higher-Intensity Mixed Use;

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

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 501-034-003;

WHEREAS, on January 17, 2016, the Applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2018, the application was determined to be complete;

WHEREAS, on May 2, 2018, the El Cerrito Design Review Board held a duly noticed public hearing, considered the project, and continued the item to the June 6, 2018 Design Review Board meeting; and

WHEREAS, on June 6, 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, the standards for the Transit-Oriented Higher-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. PL17-0006, subject to the following conditions:
1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated May 22, 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 the 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 the 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. 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 issuance of building permit, the Applicant shall pay a fee ($124,077.90) in-lieu of the provision of the public open space on the project site.

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.

11. Prior to the issuance of a building or demolition permit the Applicant/Developer shall submit a notice containing the following information to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. (text shown in quotes shall be reproduced verbatim on the notice.) Once approved, the text on this notice shall be
transferred onto a 6 foot by 3 foot sign on the project site’s construction fence. This temporary sign shall be made of weather resistant materials and remain in place for the duration of the construction of the project.

a. “Emergency contact number: 9-1-1”.
    “This number should only be used in case of fire or criminal activity is observed.”

b. “Urgent contact numbers:”
    “These numbers should be used for urgent issues such as dust and noise concerns.”
    The telephone number and name of person to contact (construction liaison) that is authorized to address urgent concerns on the project team’s team. “This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours of receipt of complaint.”

c. The Air District’s phone number:
    “Bay Area Air Quality Management District: 1-800-334-ODOR (6367) for any issue related to dust and/or air quality”

d. The number of the “Development Service Manager in El Cerrito (510) 215-4332 if any community member has questions or concerns regarding the project.”

e. A color rendering of the new project that has been approved for construction along with a brief, factual project description. An interested party contact is also allowed in this section of the notice.

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

12. 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.

13. 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. Hydroteed 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 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.

14. 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.

15. 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

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.
19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.
22. 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.

23. 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 cause 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:

24. The project design shall implement the following measures to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less, in compliance with City noise standards:
   Interior Noise Control Measures
   • Exterior finishes shall have a minimum STC rating of 46
   • Residential doors and windows along the eastern façade shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30
   • Residential doors and windows along the northern façade within 150 feet of San Pablo Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
   • All residential doors and windows along the southern façade shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
   • Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residential units on the project site so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise and achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less

   As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the Applicant may provide a detailed acoustical analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should 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.

25. Mechanical equipment shall be selected and designed to reduce impacts on surrounding uses to meet the City’s 60 dBA Leq daytime and 56 dBA Leq nighttime noise level requirements at the property line of nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further noise reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, selection of equipment that emits low noise levels and/installation of noise barriers, such as enclosures and parapet walls, to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the nearest receptors. Alternate measures may include locating equipment in less noise-sensitive areas, such as the rooftop of the building away from the building’s edge nearest the noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible.

26. The Applicant shall ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the adjacent crosswalk by installing mirrors on both sides of the driveway to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and install flashing lights to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway.

27. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and the Applicant shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to implement: 1) distribution of BikeLink cards with $20.00 value to each resident of the project; 2) provision and operation of a fleet of four shared cars located in the parking garage for the project and free membership to the car share service for all residents of the project.
28. The project shall include dark bronze colored aluminum windows on the building elevation facing San Pablo Avenue and may include VPI vinyl windows of a similar color on the remaining elevations.

Public Works Department:

29. 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.

30. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated April 24, 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/).

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

32. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

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

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

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

36. 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.

37. 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.

38. 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.

39. 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:

40. Compliance with the Building Code and associated codes in effect whenever the building plans are submitted is required.
Fire Department:

41. 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 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 120v Powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

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

Stege Sanitary District:
43. Applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program. Applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
44. Construction of the new trash room shall be 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 June 6, 2018, upon motion of Commissioner _____, second by Commissioner ______:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Senior Planner
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ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST
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May 2018
# Avenue Lofts - 10167 San Pablo Avenue

## CEQA Environmental Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Avenue Lofts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Lead agency name and address:** | City of El Cerrito Planning Division  
10890 San Pablo Avenue  
El Cerrito, CA 94530 |
| **Contact person and phone number** | Sean Moss (510) 215-4359 |
| **Project Location:** | 10167 San Pablo Avenue  
El Cerrito, CA 94530 |
| **File Number:** | PL17-0006 |
| **Project sponsor’s name and address:** | Charlie Oewel, Developer  
1606 Juanita Lane, Suite A  
Tiburon, CA 94920 |
| **Property Owner:** | 10167 SPA, LLC  
175 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Suite 201  
Annapolis, MD 21401 |
| **General Plan Designation:** | Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) |
| **Zoning:** | Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) |
| **Description of project:** | The project would include demolition of the one existing structure on site and construction of a new 48,641 square foot, six story, 64-foot tall multi-family residential building with a total of 62 dwelling units and 31 parking spaces. |
| **Surrounding land uses and setting briefly describe the project’s surroundings:** | Located immediately adjacent and north of the project site is a parking lot which is the site of a proposed 6-story project that would contain 73 residential units and over 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. Commercial properties, including a dry-cleaner, restaurant, and dental office, are located east of the project site across San Pablo Avenue. The project site is bounded to the west by two-story, multi-family housing. To the south, the project site is bordered by a gas station and drive-through fast food restaurant with parking lot. |
| **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):** | None. |
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1 Introduction

This checklist and attached supporting documentation have been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Avenue Lofts development (project) in relationship to the prior environmental review conducted for the project site in the City of El Cerrito’s San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (Specific Plan EIR). This analysis considers whether the environmental impacts of the project have already been analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code (PRC), Section 21000, et seq.).

This document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines as implemented by the City of El Cerrito (City). According to Section 15168(c)(2) of the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR can be used to address the effects of a subsequent activity as long as the activity is within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, no new effects are found, and no new mitigation measures would be required. As supported by the analysis in this document, the Avenue Lofts Project would not result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than what was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR.

1.1 Project Background and Prior CEQA Documentation

In 2007, the City began the process to prepare a Specific Plan for San Pablo Avenue. The major goals of the Specific Plan were to articulate a vision for the future of San Pablo Avenue, identify improvements, and adopt context-sensitive regulations that could be applied along its length and to adjacent areas.

In 2014, the City certified the Specific Plan EIR (State Clearinghouse #2014042025) and adopted the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The Specific Plan includes (1) a Form-Based Code (FBC) to provide clear signals to developers as to the type, location, and shape of desired development; (2) multimodal transportation goals and policies including streetscape design improvements, and design standards as part of the Complete Streets Plan; and (3) infrastructure improvements to support new development.

1.2 CEQA Requirements

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. This checklist confirms the 10167 San Pablo Avenue Project would be within the planning area of the Specific Plan EIR 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 Specific Plan EIR. As such, the City finds that impacts resulting from implementation of the Avenue Lofts Project would be within the scope of the Specific Plan EIR and no new environmental document is required. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, the 10167 San Pablo Avenue Project does not require any further review under CEQA.
2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location and Setting

The project site is at 10167 San Pablo Avenue (APN 510-034-003-2) in the southwestern portion of the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California, as shown in Figure 1. The project site is located near the northwestern corner of the San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue intersection. The project site is largely flat, with a slight elevation gain of approximately 2 feet at the northeast side. The site contains an existing vacant outbuilding constructed in 1968, asphalt paving, and perimeter landscaping.

Located immediately adjacent and north of the project site is a parking lot which is the site of a separate, proposed 6-story project that would contain 73 residential units and over 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. Commercial properties, including a dry-cleaner, restaurant, and dental office, are located east of the project site across San Pablo Avenue. The project site is bordered to the west by two-story multi-family housing. To the south, the project site is bordered by a gas station and drive-through fast food restaurant with parking lot. Surrounding land uses are depicted in Figure 2.

The project site is located within the Specific Plan area and has a land use designation of Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) as shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. The zoning for the project site is also TOHIMU. The Specific Plan designates the portion of San Pablo Avenue adjacent to the project site as a Community Street and Central Avenue as a Gateway Street. Multi-family residential land use is permitted for TOHIMU per Section 2.03.03 of the Specific Plan. There have been no substantial changes in environmental circumstances at or around the project site since certification of the Specific Plan EIR; the existing environment remains much as described in the Specific Plan EIR.

2.2 Specific Plan Development Capacity

The Specific Plan provides the framework for future development along San Pablo Avenue. The Specific Plan EIR analyzed a maximum development capacity of 1,706 new residential units and 243,112 square feet of new commercial space, as shown in Table 1. Since approval of the Specific Plan, 917 residential units and 30,662 square feet of commercial space are under construction, have been proposed, or are in some stage of the City’s approval process.

---

1 Joe DeCredico Studio, project plans, 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1  San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area Development Capacity 2013-2040</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Commercial (Square Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Existing Conditions (2013)</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2,016,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Development – Net New (2040)</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>243,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Future– Existing (2013) + Net New (2040)</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>2,259,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Capacity Remaining (2018)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>212,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 Project Characteristics

The project would include demolition of the one existing structure on site and construction of a new 48,641 square-foot, six-story, 64-foot tall\(^2\) multi-family residential building with a total of 62 dwelling units, as shown on Figure 5. The proposed residential units would include a combination of studios, 1-bedroom, and 2-bedroom units. Construction of the project is expected to be completed in one phase and last approximately 18 months.

The project would be accessible by automobiles, public transit, bicycles, and walking. A bus stop is located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue, and the El Cerrito Plaza Bart station is approximately 0.25 miles east of the project site. The project would enhance pedestrian and bicycle access by updating the sidewalk along the project perimeter on San Pablo Avenue and installing 93 long-term bicycle storage spaces in an underground garage. Seven short-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided for the project along San Pablo Avenue. Auto access to the project would be provided via a 20-foot wide driveway along San Pablo Avenue, connecting to a surface parking lot with 3 parking spaces and a subsurface parking garage with 31 parking spaces, including 2 electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. The 31 parking spaces would provide a parking ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit, which would be consistent with TOHIMU regulations in the Specific Plan, which set forth a parking maximum of 1 space per unit.

The building would be set back a minimum of 15 feet, 10 inches from the curb line of San Pablo Avenue on the ground floor. Starting at the fourth floor, the project would be stepped back at the rear of the building at a 45-degree angle, as shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Landscaping would be provided along San Pablo Avenue, along the perimeters of the project site, and a 2,639 square foot rooftop deck available for residents’ use, as shown in Figure 8.

\(^2\) Measured from the finished grade to bottom of parapet along San Pablo Avenue.
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3 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

The following discussion addresses the potential level of impact relating to each aspect of the environment.

3.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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, 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 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 affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As noted in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan would enhance the visual and aesthetic character of the planning area by incorporating Form-Based Code and Complete Streets design guidelines and development standards. These guidelines and standards 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 Specific Plan.

The City’s location between the I-80 freeway 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 Specific Plan EIR was the potential for Specific Plan development to obstruct scenic views of Mt. Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Francisco skyline, 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 Specific Plan EIR 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 right-of-way of streets that run east and west, as well as BART platforms. The project plans modeled the views from the platform of the El Cerrito Plaza BART station, with the addition of the project, as shown in Figure 9. These images show that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mount 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 within the southwestern portion of the City, which has a lower elevation.
- Streets that run east and west with potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Central Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and Avila Street. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site from Central Avenue and Eureka Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Avila Street may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the public right-of-way of Avila Street.
- The Specific Plan limits building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The project would be less than 200 feet in length.

The Specific Plan EIR also determined potentially significant impacts could result from the introduction of new light and glare in the plan area (Impact 4-2), but concluded 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. With adherence to this mitigation measure, the project would not cause any new light and glare impacts.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4-2 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, 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. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

---
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Source: Joe DeCredico Studio, project plans, 2017
### 3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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) 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 with 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>

### Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR determined there are no agricultural or forestry resources located within or near the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan area is predominantly urbanized and is classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. There is no land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within Specific Plan area or the City. In addition, the City does not contain woodland, forestland cover, or land zoned for timberland production. The project is within the Specific Plan area and therefore is not located on land that is currently under a Williamson Act contract or any other type of agricultural or forestry land. Given this, no new impacts would occur.

---

3.3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Discussion

Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 requires individual projects to undergo individual assessment for construction health risks, either through screening or refined modeling. Therefore, a project-specific Air Quality Analysis report was prepared for the project and is included as Appendix A. The results of this analysis are provided below.

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 Specific Plan EIR was the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP). The Specific Plan EIR found that since the Specific Plan would not cause significant increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) compared to service population growth, and would not interfere with CAP control measures, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in a less-than-significant impact related to consistency with the applicable clean air plan.
BAAQMD’s current clean air plan is the 2017 CAP, which was adopted on April 19, 2017. The 2017 CAP provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. To protect public health, the plan describes how BAAQMD will continue progress toward attaining all State and federal air quality standards and eliminating health risk disparities caused by air pollution among Bay Area communities. To protect the climate, the plan defines a vision for transitioning the Bay Area to a post-carbon economy and provides a regional climate protection strategy that will put the Bay Area on a pathway to achieve ambitious greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets for 2030 and 2050.

The 2017 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 pollutants include particulate matter, ozone, and toxic air contaminants (TACs). Additionally, the 2017 CAP includes measures to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by reducing fossil fuel combustion, as well as methane and other “super-GHGs” that have a larger greenhouse gas effect than carbon dioxide in the near-term.

Consistency with the CAP is determined by whether or not a 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).

Implementation of the project would locate future residents within walking distance of public transportation, jobs, restaurants, and services, all of which would individually and collectively encourage residents to reduce their VMT. In addition, dwelling units constructed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR.

As discussed above, implementation of the project would not increase population, vehicle trips, or VMT above what was anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Trip generation anticipated under the project is discussed in detail in Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic. Therefore, the project would support the goals of the CAP and would not conflict with any of the control measures identified in the CAP designed to bring the Bay Area into attainment. Consistent with the Specific Plan EIR, this impact would remain less than significant.

Construction-Related Impacts

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction from implementation of the Specific Plan would result in short-term emissions. Such activities would include 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 and can become a nuisance and potential health hazard to those living and working nearby. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 5-1 which would require BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1 would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Development of the project would result in similar construction-related, short-term air quality impacts as those impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 5-1 would be required. With adherence to the mitigation measure, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-related air quality impacts than those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.
Ambient Air Quality Impacts

As described in the Specific Plan EIR, monitoring data from all ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Bay Area indicate existing carbon monoxide (CO) levels currently meet State and national ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the Bay Area has been designated as an attainment area for CO emissions. At the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified, the highest measured CO levels at the closest monitoring station to the Specific Plan area over the previous three years were 1.3 parts per million (ppm) for eight-hour averaging periods, compared with State and Federal criteria of 9.0 ppm. Monitored CO levels have decreased substantially since 1990 as newer vehicles with greatly improved exhaust emission control systems have replaced older vehicles.

Even though CO levels in the Bay Area are well below ambient air quality standards, elevated levels of CO still warrant analysis. CO hotspots (occurrences of localized high CO concentrations) can occur near busy, congested intersections. Recognizing the relatively low CO concentrations experienced in the Bay Area, 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 Specific Plan EIR, peak hour traffic volumes attributed to implementation of the Specific Plan would be far below this threshold. The project would not generate vehicles trips beyond what was considered and analyzed in the Specific Plan. Given this, impacts related to CO hotspots would remain less than significant. Further discussion of project trip generation is provided in Section 3.16, Transportation/Traffic.

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. The Specific Plan EIR determined construction activities could result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known TAC. Individuals particularly vulnerable to DMP 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.

The length of time sensitive receptors are exposed to TACs and the concentration of TACs during exposure are the primary factors used to determine health risk. Health risk is quantitatively evaluated by determining the potential for 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.

Sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. Construction of the project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, construction contractors would be required to implement the best management practices (BMPs) during construction, as required by Mitigation Measure 5-1. With implementation of BAAQMD-recommended measures to control particulate matter emissions during construction, Mitigation Measure 5-1 would ensure that project construction emissions would fall below BAAQMD’s significance thresholds as described in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant
concentrations during project construction. The project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to short-term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, and further analysis is not required.

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

Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the placement of new sensitive receptors in the Specific Plan area, as well as new non-residential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. The roadway screening analysis tables from the Specific Plan EIR indicate 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 Specific Plan EIR determined that if individual projects are constructed under the Specific Plan in close proximity to surface streets with daily traffic volumes higher than 40,000 ADT, a potentially significant impact would occur. Mitigation Measure 5-3 requires completion of a site-specific health risk assessment for projects within close proximity to these roadways.

The project site is located within 15 feet of San Pablo Avenue and 100 feet of Central Avenue. Therefore, to comply with Mitigation Measure 5-3, a project-specific health risk assessment was prepared in December 2017 (Appendix A).

According to BAAQMD, a project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Individually expose sensitive receptors to TACs resulting in an increased cancer risk greater than 10.0 in one million,
- Increase non-cancer risk of greater than 1.0 on the hazard index (chronic or acute), or
- Cause an annual average ambient particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) increase greater than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter (μg/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 air quality assessment calculated TACs within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site. TAC emissions from traffic on nearby roadways including San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue, and TACs from stationary sources were calculated. Permitted stationary sources of air pollution near the project site were identified using BAAQMD’s Stationary Source Risk and Hazard Analysis Tool. This mapping tool identified the location of two stationary sources and their estimated risk and hazard impacts. Only one of these sources produces TAC emissions: a “76” gas station, located at 3160 Carlson Boulevard, approximately 130 feet southwest of the closest proposed residences under the project.

The combined community risk levels at the project site from all sources (roadways and stationary sources) are summarized in Table 2. Combined health risks for all measured TACs are below BAAQMD thresholds.
Table 2  Community Risk Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (per million)*</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ Concentration ($\mu$g/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Acute and Chronic Hazard (HI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadways – San Pablo Avenue at 25 feet; 20,580 Average Daily Trips</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadways – Central Avenue at 170 feet; 9,100 Average Daily Trips</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Gas Station at 130 feet</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>&lt;0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BAAQMD Thresholds:
- Single Source (Maximum): 10.0 0.3 1.0
- Total (Cumulative) Sources: 100 0.8 10.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Cancer risk adjusted for 2015 OEHHA methods

The project would not result in new or more severe impacts related to long term exposure to TACs than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, further analysis is not required.

**Odors**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded the Specific Plan area includes potential odor sources that could affect new sensitive receptors. However, most of these major existing sources are 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 existing odors. According to the Specific Plan, several land use types within the City are known to produce objectionable odors. The project site is not located within 1.0 miles of such odor-generating properties or land-use types. Given this, the project site would not be subject to potential odor complaints or associated impacts. Similarly, the project would entail residential development and would not create a new sources of objectionable odors.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures 5-1** would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. **Mitigation Measures 5-2 and 5-3** have been fulfilled through preparation of the project air quality health risk assessment. No new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species 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>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 impact 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 an established 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 Specific Plan EIR found that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources, because the Specific Plan area is almost entirely urbanized with approximately 90 percent of the land developed, recently disturbed, or ruderal. The Specific Plan EIR concluded 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

In addition, the Specific Plan area does not contain any federally protected wetlands. The only identified riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community within the Specific Plan area is riparian habitat adjacent to Cerrito Creek (near the El Cerrito Plaza Shopping Center parking lot and Ohlone Greenway) and Baxter Creek. Cerrito Creek is located approximately 0.3 miles south of the project site. The creek is separated from the project site by dense residential and commercial land uses and several local arterial roadways including Carlson Boulevard, San Pablo Avenue, and Central Avenue, which all have at least four travel lanes.

Baxter Creek at Gateway Park is located approximately 2.0 miles northwest of the project site, and is also separated from the project site by dense residential, commercial, and industrial land uses as well as several highly trafficked roadways. As it is unlikely for species to traverse the urban, built-up land uses between Cerrito Creek, Baxter Creek, and the project site, implementation of the project would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to these habitats or the species that my occur within these natural communities. The project site is covered in paved surfaces with no surface vegetation beyond street trees along the project perimeter. As such, the project site does not provide any valuable habitat beyond the street trees.

The Specific Plan EIR identified potential impacts associated with the removal of existing trees with implementation of the Specific Plan. Removal of existing trees containing nest or eggs of migratory birds, raptors or bird species during the nesting season would be considered an “unlawful take” under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and USFW provisions protecting migratory and nesting birds. As the project would require removal of 2 trees, adherence to Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be mandatory. Mitigation Measure 6-1 avoids the removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation during the bird nesting season spanning February 1 through August 31. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be required to adequately minimize potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal on nesting birds to less-than-significant levels.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with Mitigation Measure 6-1. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred for this topic, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic features?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

---

**Discussion**

**Historic Resources**

The Specific Plan EIR identified properties or features within the Specific Plan area that may be eligible for listing in a local, State, or Federal register of historic resources. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 7-1 to be applied to any individual discretionary project within the Specific Plan area that the City determines may involve a property that contains a potentially significant historic resource. Per Mitigation Measure 7-1, such a resource shall be evaluated by City staff, and if warranted, shall be assessed by a qualified professional on the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) list of consultants who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to determine whether or not the property is a significant historic resource and whether or not the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the historic resource.

The project site contains one remnant outbuilding constructed in 1963 that is proposed for demolition. Buildings older than 45 years in age are routinely considered as potential historic resources pending evaluation by a qualified professional. To evaluate this building, a Historical Resource Assessment, including research and a field visit, was prepared in November 2017. The Historical Resource

---

6 A potentially significant historic resource is defined as a property that is unrecorded and thus, has not been listed in or formally determined eligible or ineligible for listing in any local, state or federal register. Properties containing unrecorded buildings or structures over 45 years old are conservatively considered potentially significant and historic.
Assessment is included as Appendix B. As documented in the assessment, the structure located on the project site does not meet any of the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, and is thus not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.\(^7\)

**Archeological and Paleontological Resources**

The Specific Plan EIR concluded potential impacts on cultural resources from development within the Specific Plan area, including archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains, would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Discovery and disturbance of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, could occur during grading and excavation at individual project sites. The Specific Plan EIR concluded **Mitigation Measure 7-2** and **Mitigation Measure 7-3** would reduce potential impacts on unknown cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

In accordance with Specific Plan EIR **Mitigation Measure 7-2**, a non-confidential CHRIS records search was undertaken at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University for the project site and vicinity (Included in Appendix B).\(^8\) The records search confirmed there are no recorded cultural resources on the project site or in the project vicinity. However, the records search determined there is a high potential of identifying Native American archaeological resources and a high potential of identifying historic-period archaeological resources within the project site and vicinity.

Implementation of Specific Plan EIR **Mitigation Measure 7-2** and **Mitigation Measure 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. These measures ensure that if archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. These mitigation measures would minimize any potentially significant impacts associated with accidental archaeological discoveries to a less-than-significant level.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 7-2** and **Mitigation Measure 7-3** would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. **Mitigation Measure 7-1** has been fulfilled through preparation of the project Historic Resources Assessment and CHRIS search. No new mitigation measures would be required.

---

\(^7\) JRP, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Historical Resource Assessment for the Property at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California.

\(^8\) 10167 San Pablo Avenue CHRIS Request, 2017.
Conclusion
The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the Specific Plan EIR. Ground disturbing activities would be conducted in conformance with Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measures 7-2 and Mitigation Measure 7-3. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.6 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   
iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Would the project 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 18-1b 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

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that geologic and soil impacts would be primarily related to potential ground shaking during seismic events and associated impacts related to ground failure. Since the Specific Plan area is not located within an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, the likelihood of surface fault rupture is minimal. The Specific Plan EIR determined slope instability hazards are minimal due to the absence of appreciable slopes in the Specific Plan area.

The Specific Plan area is susceptible to ground shaking from the Hayward Fault or one of the other active faults in the region. The Hayward Fault is the nearest active fault to the Specific Plan area, approximately 1 mile to the east. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined 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.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded grading and construction activities within the Specific Plan area may result in minor erosion or the minor loss of some topsoil. The project site is entirely covered in paved surfaces, and would be excavated to construct an underground parking garage. However, implementation of City-required grading and construction-period erosion control techniques would mitigate the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of the Specific Plan 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 Specific Plan 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.

Expansive soil or soil with shrink-swell potential and low strength with variations in moisture content is a common cause of foundation distress. As indicated by the Foundation Investigation and Recommendation report completed for the project site in April 2017 (included in this document as Appendix C),9 the project site is largely underlain by soils known to be highly expansive. However, damage to surface improvements from expansive soils may be avoided by proper engineering of the foundations and flatwork and with installation and continued maintenance of landscaping and proper drainage. Per Mitigation Measure 8-1, the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical study will be implemented, reducing this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon where soils are subject to a loss of strength because of pressure from earthquakes. Soils found at the project site are a type generally not susceptible to liquefaction. Lateral spreading is a failure within a nearly horizontal soil layer that could occur due to liquefaction. Effects of lateral spreading from ground shaking would be reduced or avoided by designing structures to resist lateral forces in accordance with the 2016 California Building Code.

---

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-1 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project design plans are consistent with development standards analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the California Building Code, City-required erosion control techniques, and Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 8-1. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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) 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>

Discussion

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

To calculate GHG emissions, Specific Plan land use types, total square footage of anticipated development, and trip generation rates were input to CalEEMod. CalEEMod predicts emissions of GHGs in the form of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions (CO₂e). Specific Plan GHG emissions were computed using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for two traffic scenarios, Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift. Both scenarios were calculated using projected operational emissions in 2040.

CalEEMod results showed that in the cumulative scenario year (2040), development under the Specific Plan would have per capita emissions of 3.9 and 3.7 MT of CO₂e per year under Without Mode Shift and With Mode Shift cases, respectively. The modeled per capita emissions for the Specific Plan would not exceed BAAQMD specific plan-level threshold of 4.6 MT of CO₂e /year. Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than significant.

BAAQMD does not have adopted thresholds of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. Instead, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of BMPs 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.
As documented in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the State and local level regarding GHG emissions. The Specific Plan is also subject to local and General Plan policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions, including policies in the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. Given this, the Specific Plan is consistent with and conforms with applicable GHG emission reduction plans.

The project would be required to adhere to the building guidelines in the Specific Plan, would be consistent with the El Cerrito Climate Action Plan, and would promote reductions in GHG emissions through mixed-use development in close proximity to transit. The project would result in no new or more severe impacts related to GHG emissions than analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and further analysis is not required.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for greenhouse gas impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be required to comply with the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code and El Cerrito Climate Action Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
### 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A table displaying the impact of various activities on hazards and hazardous materials, divided into categories:

- **Significant Impact**
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**
- **Less-than-Significant Impact**
- **No New Impact**

#### Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</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>Significant Impact</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>Significant Impact</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>Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied 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>Significant Impact</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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>Significant Impact</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>Significant Impact</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>Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to the 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>Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR concluded no significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would occur. The Specific Plan EIR did identify the potential for development 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 that previously operated in the Specific Plan area, including the project site. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined that compliance with all applicable 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.

The Specific Plan EIR determined residential, commercial, and open space uses proposed as part of the Specific Plan 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 Specific Plan area may involve the occasional transport, use, storage, or disposal of common hazardous substances such as fuel, paint, and solvents. These operations would be subject to local, state, and federal regulations. The Specific Plan EIR determined that implementation of these standard regulations would ensure potential impacts would be less than significant.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project site in December 2016 and is included as Appendix D. According to the Phase I ESA, sites of concern within the project vicinity include two dry-cleaners, Huey’s Laundry and Dry Cleaners (10160 San Pablo Avenue) and Sunrise Tailors and Cleaners (10160 San Pablo Avenue). In addition, numerous historic and current used car lots, auto wrecking yards, gasoline service stations and auto repair businesses have existed on and in the vicinity of the project site.

The Phase I ESA recommended collection of groundwater and shallow soil samples to investigate potential impacts by these automobile-related facilities. Accordingly, a subsequent Phase II Subsurface Investigation was conducted in January 2017 (included as Appendix D). The Phase II Subsurface Investigation report determined there is a low potential that on-site or up-gradient leaks or spills of gasoline, diesel, or motor oil have environmentally impacted soil or groundwater beneath the project site. The investigation also determined there is a low potential that dry-cleaning solvents potentially originating from two nearby up-gradient dry-cleaners have impacted groundwater beneath the project site.

The nearest school to the project site is Fairmont Elementary School located approximately 0.3 miles north of the project site. As the project site is located further than 0.25 miles from the school, no impacts related to handling hazardous materials near a school would occur. The project site is located approximately 11 miles northwest of the nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport. As the project is not located within the Oakland International Airport Influence Area, no airport safety hazards

---


would occur. According to the Specific Plan EIR, no private airstrips are located in the project vicinity. In addition, the Specific Plan area, including the project site, is not within or adjacent to wildland area and would not be subject to wildland fire risks.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for hazards or hazardous material impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the development standards regarding hazards and hazardous materials analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. The project would be required to comply with existing regulations related to hazardous soil or groundwater conditions at the site during ground disturbing activities. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

---

### 3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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) 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 patterns 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 run-off?</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>
</tbody>
</table>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

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?

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR determined long-term water quality impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan could result in stormwater runoff contamination from petroleum and other motor vehicle contaminants. However, 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 Specific Plan EIR determined compliance with applicable Water Board and City of El Cerrito water quality protection requirements and conditions of approval would ensure any potential construction-period and post-construction water quality impacts are less-than-significant.

Construction projects are required to prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, which requires implementation of 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). El Cerrito Municipal Code section 8.40.050 states that every application for a development project is required to submit a Stormwater Control Plan that meets the criteria in the most recent version of the Contra Costa Clean Water Program Stormwater C.3 Guidebook. Consistent with Provision C.3 requirements, the project applicant has already submitted a Stormwater Control Plan as part of the project application materials. If the project is approved, the City will confirm that this plan conforms to all applicable local and State requirements as part of the development review process.

The project would increase the amount of pervious surfaces on the site by 2,344 square feet. The increase in pervious surfaces would allow for more stormwater to be absorbed through the pervious surfaces and would reduce the amount of stormwater runoff. Further, the City’s General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include specifications for BMPs that would be implemented during project construction to control contamination of surface water flows and the potential discharge of pollutants. In addition, full compliance with the Contra Costa County NPDES permit guidelines for stormwater discharge would ensure that pollutant levels in stormwater runoff would be less than significant.
The Specific Plan EIR identified that portions of the plan area (in the City of Richmond, along Central Avenue) are located within a 100-year flood zone. However, the project site is not located within this zone and would therefore not place people or structures in a 100-year flood zone. The Specific Plan EIR determined the Specific Plan area is not subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow. The southwest portion of the Specific Plan along Central Avenue in the City of Richmond is located near a Tsunami Inundation Zone; however, the project site is not within this area.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for hydrology or water quality impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be consistent with the development standards required in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
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## 3.10 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>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>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 Specific Plan EIR concluded implementation of the Specific Plan would provide for the expansion of housing choices by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing and mixed-use development in the Plan area at densities and heights greater than currently permitted. The Specific Plan EIR determined implementation of the Specific Plan would result in beneficial effects related to land use and planning by revitalizing the San Pablo Avenue corridor. The Specific Plan facilitates development where services and infrastructure can be most efficiently provided by promoting higher residential densities near or within an existing shopping, service, employment, infrastructure, and public transportation centers.

The Specific Plan would not include construction of any new roadway systems or physical barriers, and would promote connectivity along the San Pablo Avenue corridor by encouraging compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented housing. Accordingly, implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in the division of an established community.

As previously discussed, the project site is designated TOHIMU in the City’s General Plan and Specific Plan.\(^\text{14}\) In addition, the site is also zoned as TOHIMU. The intent of the TOHIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher density area within a half mile of Bay Area Rapid Transit...

---

(BART) that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the Downtown and Uptown areas. The TOHIMU designation allows for a 65-foot height limit (85 feet is permissible for projects subject to the State affordable housing bonus program) and requires a minimum height of three stories for residential uses.

The project would construct a 64-foot tall residential building, which is within the 65-foot height limit. The City’s Design Review Board will consider the project site plan and make findings related to any project design elements, as contemplated by the form based code guidelines articulated in the Specific Plan. The project would comply with the standards of the TOHIMU designation and would develop the site with high density residential uses in close proximity to transit as envisioned in the Specific Plan EIR. The El Cerrito Plaza BART station is located approximately 0.25 miles east of the project site, and a bus stop is located at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue.

### Applicable Mitigation

The Specific Plan would result in beneficial land use and planning effects. The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for land use and planning impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be consistent with the development standards envisioned in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.

---

3.11 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? □ □ □ ☒

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? □ □ □ ☒

Discussion

As stated in the Specific Plan EIR, the El Cerrito General Plan determined that there are no mineral resources within the Specific Plan area. Accordingly, there are no identified resources in proximity to the project site.¹⁶ Given this, implementation of the project would have no impact on mineral resources.

---

## 3.12 Noise and Vibration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Result in 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 the other agencies?  

b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

---

**Discussion**

This section compares construction and operational noise impacts from the project with impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. While the Specific Plan EIR addressed noise and vibration impacts more generally, a Noise Impact Study was completed for the project in December 2017.

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 generated by the project. Stationary source noise includes noise generated by the residential land use such as exterior mechanical equipment (air conditioning systems, fans, etc.). Given the nature of the project, proposed dwelling
units are not anticipated to introduce long-term operational vibration impacts to the surrounding area. In turn, existing sources of vibration in the project vicinity would not result in adverse impacts to residents.

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 closest sensitive receptors include residential buildings to the west of the project site.

*Exterior Noise Environment*

The Specific Plan EIR determined new residential land uses developed under the Specific Plan would be exposed to exterior noise levels of 70 dBA Ldn or greater, which exceed El Cerrito’s noise and land use compatibility standards. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-1, which requires project-specific acoustical analyses, to reduce potential land use compatibility impacts to a less-than-significant level.

A Noise Impact Study was conducted for the project in December 2017 to satisfy the City’s requirement for a project-specific noise impact analysis, per Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 13-1. Future noise levels were estimated based on noise measurement data gathered at the project site in November 2017 and cumulative (2040) traffic increases calculated in the Specific Plan EIR. Noise measurement details are provided in Appendix E.

Under existing conditions, the exterior noise environment ranges from 57 to 70 dBA during the day and 51 to 68 dBA at night. This is based on noise measurements taken at the project site in November 2017. In the future, after full buildout of the Specific Plan, the exterior noise environment is anticipated to increase up to 1 dBA Ldn, resulting in future noise levels ranging from 70 to 71 dBA Ldn at a distance of 50 feet from San Pablo Avenue.

The proposed fifth- and sixth-floor roof decks would be partially shielded from traffic noise by the design of the building and the building height. The setback of the easternmost edge of the roof deck would be approximately 65 feet or more from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. At this distance, the roof deck would have future exterior noise levels below 60 dBA Ldn. At the northern and southern edges of the roof decks, future noise levels would be up to 61 dBA Ldn. However, since the majority of the activity areas would be located towards the center of the outdoor spaces and away from the edges of the roof decks, the building height and design would provide adequate shielding to reduce future exterior noise levels to 60 dBA Ldn or less.

The ground level open space at the rear (western) side of the building would be shielded from traffic noise by the building, and would be 180 feet or more from San Pablo Avenue. At this distance, future exterior noise levels would be 60 dBA Ldn or less.

Therefore, outdoor use areas associated with the project would not be exposed to noise levels that would exceed the City’s exterior noise level limits. The future noise environment would be compatible with the City’s General Plan threshold and would not result in new or greater impacts than those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.
**Interior Noise Environment**

Interior noise environment is dependent on both the exterior noise environment (noise coming in from outside) and the noise attenuation capabilities of the selected building materials. Exterior noise levels on all sides of the project would range from 60 to 71 dBA Ldn, as described below.

The proposed residential units along the building’s eastern side would be set back 50 to 55 feet from the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. These residential units would be exposed to traffic noise with little noise shielding. At a distance of 50 to 55 feet, dwelling units on the eastern side of the building would be exposed to future exterior noise levels ranging from 70 to 71 dBA Ldn.

The northern and southern façades would be exposed to largely unobstructed noise from San Pablo Avenue at a distance of 50 to 190 feet. The southern façade would also be exposed to traffic noise from Central Avenue at a distance of 200 to 230 feet. At these distances, units along the northern façade would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 64 to 71 dBA Ldn, and units along the southern façade would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 66 to 71 dBA Ldn.

Due to the angle of the proposed building and the location of existing surrounding buildings, the western façade would be mostly shielded from traffic noise and would be exposed to exterior noise levels ranging from 60 to 66 dBA Ldn.

Standard construction for residential buildings under the California Building Code (STC-24 to STC-28) would provide more than 25 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows closed and 15 dBA with windows open. When windows in the future dwelling units along the north, east, and south sides of the building are open, interior noise levels would not meet the City’s normally acceptable residential interior noise standard of 45 dBA Ldn (i.e., 71 dBA – 15 dBA = 56 dBA).

Therefore, an alternate form of ventilation, such as an air-conditioning system, would be required to ensure that windows can remain closed for prolonged time periods. Implementation of the following noise reduction measure, consistent with the requirements of Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 13-1, would be required to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less:

1. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval:** The project design shall implement the following measures to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less, in compliance with City noise standards:
   - **Interior Noise Control Measures**
     - Exterior finishes shall have a minimum STC rating of 46
     - Residential doors and windows along the eastern façade shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30
     - Residential doors and windows along the northern façade within 150 feet of San Pablo Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
     - All residential doors and windows along the southern façade shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
   - Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residential units on the project site so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise and achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less
• As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the applicant may provide a detailed acoustical analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should 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.

Construction Noise

Construction is permitted by the City 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 or holidays. The highest construction noise levels would be generated during grading and excavation, with lower noise levels occurring during other construction activities. 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 65 to 88 dBA measured at a distance of 50 feet from the site during busy construction periods. 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 attenuate the noise, resulting in lower noise levels.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that while construction noise would be temporary and localized to individual project sites, existing businesses and residences would be intermittently exposed to high levels of noise throughout Specific Plan implementation. 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, was determined to be a potentially significant impact. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 13-3, which provides mitigation for temporary construction noise at residential and commercial land uses. However, construction noise impacts remain significant and unavoidable.

Project construction is expected to take 18 months to complete. The project-specific Noise Impact Study assumed a typical maximum construction noise level of 70 to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet during the noisiest construction activities. Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on adjacent uses; the closest off-site sensitive receptors may be subject to short term construction noise reaching 90 dBA.

Therefore, noise levels would at times exceed 60 dBA Leq at nearby residential land uses and would at times exceed 70 dBA Leq at nearby commercial land uses. Further, ambient noise levels at the surrounding uses would potentially be increased by 5 dBA Leq or more at various times throughout construction. Mitigation Measure 13-3 would be required.

While project construction could elevate noise levels at adjacent businesses and residences by 15 to 20 dBA, this impact is consistent with construction noise impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period noise impacts than those anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Implementation of the project would be required to comply with the Municipal Code and General Plan, and would require implementation of Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 13-3.
Construction-Related Vibration

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction under the Specific Plan would in some cases be located directly adjacent to existing weakened structures. Depending on the proximity of existing structures to the construction site, the structural soundness of the surrounding existing buildings, and the methods of construction used, construction may cause vibration levels high enough to damage existing structures.

The Specific Plan EIR determined construction-related vibration impacts would be potentially significant and identified Mitigation Measure 13-4, which requires projects to avoid pile driving, vibratory rolling, and tampers wherever feasible, and requires site-specific vibration studies in areas where project construction is anticipated to include vibration-generating activities. Since avoiding all use of vibration-generating construction equipment may not be feasible, even with mitigation, this impact was found to be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-4 would be required for the project. No historic buildings or buildings that are documented to be structurally weakened are adjacent to or adjoin the project site. Construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams) are used. Construction activities would include site preparation work, foundation work, and new building framing and finishing. Construction of the project would also involve demolition of one small concrete structure and excavation for an underground parking structure. Pile driving, which can cause excessive vibration, is not anticipated to be required or used during project construction.

The nearest existing residential structures are located 25 feet from the western property line. At this distance, construction vibration levels would be up to 0.21 inches/second Peak Particle Velocity (in/sec PPV), which is below the 0.3 in/sec PPV threshold. Residential structures are also located approximately 40 feet to the north of the site. At this distance buildings would be exposed to vibration levels at or below 0.13 in/sec PPV. Additionally, a commercial building approximately 50 feet south of the site and would be exposed to vibration levels at or below 0.10 in/sec PPV. Opposite San Pablo Avenue, to the east of the project site, commercial and residential structures would be exposed to vibration levels up to 0.04 in/sec PPV.

Therefore, vibration levels due to the use of construction equipment would not exceed the 0.3 in/sec PPV vibration threshold. The project would not result in any new or more significant construction-period vibration impacts than were described in the Specific Plan EIR.

Permanent Stationary Source Noise Impacts

The Specific Plan EIR determined that new permanent mechanical equipment installed as a part of Specific Plan commercial development would generate noise, further increase the ambient noise environment and result in a potentially significant noise impact. The Specific Plan EIR 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. The project would not introduce new commercial uses; therefore, this mitigation measure would not apply.
Multi-family residential buildings typically require various mechanical equipment including air conditioners, exhaust fans, and air handling equipment for ventilation of the buildings. A mechanical equipment room would be located in the basement level garage of the project building, and mechanical equipment would also be located on the rooftop.

According to the City’s General Plan, mechanical equipment noise must be maintained at or below 55 dBA Leq during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and at or below 45 dBA Leq during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at sensitive receptors. Residences located to the west of the project site experience an average daytime ambient noise environment of 60 dBA Leq and nighttime average ambient noise environment of 56 dBA Leq.

As described in the General Plan, if ambient noise levels exceed acceptable levels, the threshold for impacts to the environment shall be an increase in the ambient noise environment. Therefore, operation of the project must maintain an ambient noise level of 60 dBA Leq during daytime hours and at or below 56 dBA Leq during nighttime hours at the adjacent residences to meet the City’s stationary noise requirements.

Given the close proximity of noise-sensitive receptors and the unknown type of mechanical equipment to be selected, it is conservatively assumed that mechanical equipment noise could result in an increase in the ambient noise environment at these receptors. Implementation of the following noise reduction measure would be required:

2. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval**: Mechanical equipment shall be selected and designed to reduce impacts on surrounding uses to meet the City’s 60 dBA Leq daytime and 56 dBA Leq nighttime noise level requirements at the property line of nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further noise reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, selection of equipment that emits low noise levels and/installation of noise barriers, such as enclosures and parapet walls, to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the nearest receptors. Alternate measures may include locating equipment in less noise-sensitive areas, such as the rooftop of the building away from the building’s edge nearest the noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible.

**Mobile Source Noise Impacts**

Motor vehicles are the dominant noise source in the project vicinity, and implementation of the project would result in new daily trips on local roadways in the project site vicinity. The Specific Plan EIR found that cumulative traffic noise levels, with or without implementation of the Specific Plan, would not increase substantially along the roadways serving the Specific Plan area.

According to the City’s General Plan, a substantial increase would occur if a project would result in a 3 dBA Ldn increase over existing conditions or if any increase would result in noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn. Since existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity exceeds 60 dBA Ldn, a significant impact would occur if traffic from the project would permanently increase ambient levels by 3 dBA Ldn.
For reference, a 3 dBA Ldn noise increase would be expected if the project would double existing traffic volumes along a roadway. During the peak AM hour, the project would generate 18 trips. During the peak PM hour, the project would generate 28 trips. Compared to the existing traffic volumes along San Pablo Avenue, this would be an increase in peak hour traffic volumes of less than 2 percent. This would result in a traffic noise increase of less than 1 dBA Ldn. Therefore, the project would not result in a permanent noise increase of 3 dBA Ldn or more.

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.

**Aircraft Noise**

The Specific Plan EIR did not address potential aircraft noise impacts because the Specific Plan area is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Oakland International Airport is the closest airport and is located approximately 11 miles southeast 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, and no portion of the project site is within 2 miles of any private airfield or heliport. Therefore, consistent with the Specific Plan EIR, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to the excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources.

**Applicable Mitigation**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 13-3, Mitigation Measure 13-4, and the project-specific condition of approval would be required. Mitigation Measure 13-1 has been fulfilled through preparation of the project Noise Impact Study (Appendix E). No new mitigation would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed the Specific Plan EIR and consistent with development standards required in the Specific Plan. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.13 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly, (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts from a maximum buildout of approximately 243,112 net new square feet of commercial space, 1,706 units of residential development, and 3,840 new residents. Such growth is consistent with local and regional plans, as detailed below.

The General Plan identifies the San Pablo Avenue corridor as the focus of new housing and population growth in the City, due its proximity to existing services, including public transportation infrastructure, and the opportunities for increased land use intensity afforded by underutilized land and surface parking lots.

Further, the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission have collaboratively adopted Plan Bay Area: Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area 2012-2040 (Plan Bay Area). The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area is identified as a "Priority Development Area" in Plan Bay Area, where “infill development and intensification is envisioned.” Plan Bay Area forecasted an increase of 2,350 housing units in the Specific Plan area by 2040. While projections included in Plan Bay Area are not mandates, the 1,706 housing units proposed under the project would be consistent with local and regional plans for housing and population growth.
The Specific Plan EIR concluded population growth associated with the Specific Plan will not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth beyond the Specific Plan boundaries. Rather, Specific Plan implementation will facilitate residential and commercial growth within a transit-rich, mixed use area identified for such growth in both local and regional plans and forecasts. Therefore, the Specific Plan’s direct and indirect impact on population growth was determined to be less than significant.

As discussed in the Specific Plan EIR, implementation of the Specific Plan will not require or induce the displacement of housing. Over time, existing residential units may be voluntarily replaced by property owners in accordance with Specific Plan provisions and allowable land uses. However, the residential and mixed-use focus of the Specific Plan provides for the addition of approximately 1,706 net new residential units in the Specific Plan area, offsetting any loss of housing. Accordingly, impacts associated with displacement from the Specific Plan were found to be less than significant.

Implementation of the project would introduce 62 new housing units, which is consistent with development anticipated in the Specific Plan. For these reasons, implementation of the project would not result in any impacts related to population and housing beyond those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

**Applicable Mitigation**

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for population and housing impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

**Conclusion**

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR and would be within the growth projections evaluated in regional planning documents and the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.14 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signiﬁcant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Signiﬁcant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Signiﬁcant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) 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 public services:

i) Fire protection?  
ii) Police protection?  
iii) Schools?  
iv) Parks?  
v) Other public facilities?

Discussion

Schools

The Specific Plan area is located within the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD). According to the Specific Plan EIR, WCCUSD student yield factors for multi-family units indicate the addition of 1,706 new residences would generate approximately 1,147 new students in the District schools over the approximately 25-year horizon of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan EIR concluded new students would be accommodated in existing WCCUSD schools, and Specific Plan implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded school facilities. As the population and housing units proposed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the Specific Plan EIR (Table 1), the number of new students generated by the project would be within the assumptions of the Specific Plan EIR. As such, existing school facilities could accommodate the project.
Fire
The Specific Plan EIR concluded additional demand associated with buildout of the Specific Plan could be accommodated by the existing El Cerrito Fire Department fire protection facilities and personnel. Specifically, the Specific Plan EIR determined any demand for additional fire protection personnel or equipment resulting from Specific Plan buildout would be funded by the annual budget review and allocation in El Cerrito. Given this, impacts to fire protection services were determined to be less than significant. As the number of dwelling units proposed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated by the Specific Plan EIR, the project would result in no new impacts associated with fire services.

Police
The Specific Plan EIR determined increased demand for police services associated with buildout of the Specific Plan would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Specific Plan EIR reasoned that implementation of the Specific Plan would result in more “eyes-on-the-street” through creation of a more pedestrian-friendly corridor, which would in turn provide a safer public environment. The Specific Plan EIR identified police department approvals that would be required on a project-by-project basis to ensure the department is equipped and has the ability to maintain acceptable levels of service. The project would add 62 new dwelling units, which is consistent with the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in new impacts to police services.

Parks and Other Public Facilities
The Specific Plan EIR determined implementation of the Specific Plan would not create a need for new or physically altered government facilities. Further discussion of parks and recreation resources is provided in Section 3.15, Parks and Recreation.

Applicable Mitigation
The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for impacts to public services, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion
Development of the project would be within the development assumptions evaluated in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.15 Parks and Recreation

Would the project:

a) 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?

- [ ] Significant Impact
- [ ] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-than-Significant Impact
- [x] No New Impact

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- [ ] Significant Impact
- [ ] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-than-Significant Impact
- [x] No New Impact

Discussion

Buildout of the Specific Plan would generate 1,706 new residences and increase the local population by 3,840 people. The increased local population would create an increased demand on parks and recreational facilities. The City’s General Plan establishes a ratio of 5 acres of parks and recreational facilities per 1,000 residents as the level of service standard. In 2010, the City had a ratio of 6.67 acres per 1,000 residents. With full buildout of the Specific Plan, which includes plans for open spaces, the ratio within the City would be 5.85 acres of parks and recreational facilities per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the ratio of 5.85 acres per 1,000 residents would be above the adopted level of service standard. The Specific Plan EIR concluded the combination of existing and proposed parks and greenways within the Specific Plan area and its vicinity would meet the City’s requirements for parks and open space.

The project would add 62 new residential units to the site, which is consistent with the anticipated population increase analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in additional demand for parks and recreational facilities beyond what was analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR.

Applicable Mitigation

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for impacts to parks and recreation resources, and no new mitigation measures would be required.
Conclusion

Development of the project would fall within the development assumptions evaluated within the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
## 3.16 Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significant</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)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts that would result from implementation of the project with impacts identified in the Specific Plan EIR. A Preliminary Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was completed for the project in November 2017 and is included as Appendix F.

The Specific Plan EIR determined buildout of the Specific Plan would cause the intersection at San Pablo Avenue/Cutting Boulevard to fall from LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E when considered cumulatively with existing conditions all other planned and reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative scenario year 2040. The Specific Plan EIR identified Mitigation Measure 16-1, which required adoption and implementation of the San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets Plan to reduce vehicle trips and change the City’s standard for acceptable LOS from D to E. However, because the projected mode shift associated with the Complete Streets Plan could not be assured, the impact was concluded to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

The Specific Plan assumed several roadway improvements would occur as part of the Specific Plan buildout. In the vicinity of the project, several roadway modifications along San Pablo Avenue in the downtown area were included to improve circulation for all modes. The City of El Cerrito is currently in the process of refining the multimodal improvements identified in the Specific Plan. The City is also developing a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to determine fair-share payment for individual development projects to finance the implementation of these improvements. The TIA determined that the additional traffic associated with the project would require fair-share mitigation fee payment, to be determined by the City. This requirement would be applied to the project as a condition of approval:

1. **Project-Specific Condition of Approval**: Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

Trip Generation

Using the same trip generation methodology used in the Specific Plan EIR, the transportation analysis estimated the project would generate 18 AM peak-hour and 28 PM peak-hour trips (See Table 3). Specific Plan EIR trip generation for the project site was projected as a part of a larger combined area called the McNevin Site. This area consisted of three parcels including the project site and two parcels to the north. A separate development is now proposed on the two parcels to the north and has been evaluated in a separate CEQA analysis. The TIA compared trip generation anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR against what is currently proposed on the McNevin Site.
Table 3  Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Plan</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10167 San Pablo Avenue (project)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate project – 10135 San Pablo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Project + Other Planned Development)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan EIR Assumption (for entire McNevin site)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017*

The project, when considered with the separately proposed project at 10135 San Pablo Avenue, would generate 54 percent more trips in the AM peak hour and 12 percent more trips in the PM peak hour than assumed in the Specific Plan EIR for the entire McNevin site.

The Specific Plan EIR analyzed the San Pablo Avenue/Central Avenue intersection within the project vicinity, and reported LOS D or better for the intersection under Existing and Cumulative conditions during both AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the additional 15 AM peak hour trips and eight PM peak hour trips generated by project and the separately proposed project at 10135 San Pablo Avenue would likely not result in significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

Since the certification of the Specific Plan EIR, 22 developments, including this project, have been proposed and are in some stage of the City’s approval process. Table 4 summarizes the total land uses for these developments, which includes 1,087 residential units and 65,571 square feet of commercial uses. Compared to the Specific Plan EIR, the combined land uses for all planned, approved, and under construction projects, including this project, are less than the planned land uses assumed in the Specific Plan EIR. Thus, the project cumulatively combined with all planned, approved, and under construction projects in the Specific Plan area would not result in significant traffic impacts beyond those identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

Table 4  Land Use Comparison: Planned, Approved, Constructed Projects in the Specific Plan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Residential (DU)</th>
<th>Commercial (KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Planned, Approved, Constructed Projects</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Projects Assumed in Specific Plan EIR</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>243.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Built out</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit
*Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017*
Vehicle Access

The TIA concluded residents and visitors of the project would access the project site via a right-in/right-out driveway on San Pablo Avenue and that the driveway and the underground garage, including the drive aisle, would provide adequate circulation for vehicles entering and exiting the garage.

The project would provide 31 private residential parking spaces (0.5 per unit), including four car-share spaces and two Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant spaces. Three of the parking spaces (including the two ADA spaces) would be standard spaces, while the remaining 28 spaces would utilize parking lifts.

Project Driveway Site Distance

The TIA provided project design recommendations to improve project driveway site distance. The project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk. Adequate sight distance is defined as a clear line-of-sight between a motorist ten feet back from the sidewalk and a pedestrian 10 feet away on each side of the driveway. Sight distance would be adequate between vehicles exiting the garage driveway and vehicles traveling southbound on San Pablo Avenue. The transportation analysis recommendation would be applied to the project as a condition of approval to ensure adequate sight distance for vehicles to avoid impacts with pedestrians.

2. Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Applicant shall ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the adjacent crosswalk by installing mirrors on both sides of the driveway to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and install flashing lights to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway.

Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation

Section 2.05.07.04 of the Specific Plan Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses. Based on the proposed number of units, 93 long-term bicycle parking spaces and 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces would be required. The Project would provide 93 covered long-term bicycle parking spaces, located in the underground parking garage, and 7 short-term bicycle parking spaces that would be located along San Pablo Avenue, meeting Specific Plan requirements.

Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation

Pedestrians would access the building via a lobby entrance along San Pablo Avenue. The lobby entrance would provide direct access to units on the first floor, as well as stair and elevator access to the upper floor units. Pedestrian access between the parking garage and the building would be provided via stairs and elevator to the lobby entrance in the front of the building.

The Specific Plan Form-Based Code (Section 2.04.02) requires a minimum clear space for pedestrians of 8 feet on all sidewalks in commercial zones and 6 feet clear space in neighborhood zones. The project would provide 8 feet of clear sidewalk space for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue, meeting Specific Plan requirements.
Parking and TDM Requirements

The Specific Plan Form-Based Code requirements for the TOHIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOHIMU zoning requires a maximum of 1.0 automobile parking space per dwelling unit and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan.

The project would provide a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit; 31 parking spaces in the underground parking garage for a total of 62 dwelling units. This would be consistent with Specific Plan parking standards.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 16-1 would be required along with implementation of the project-specific conditions of approval. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The project is consistent with the type, density, and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
3.17 Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:

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:

   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)? □ □ □ X

   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. □ □ □ X

Discussion

As confirmed in the CHRIS records search, there are no recorded cultural resources on or near the project site. As previously discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 would be required; this mitigation measure will protect previously unrecorded or unknown cultural resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

AB 52

Subsequent to certification of the Specific Plan EIR, 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. Formal consultation under AB 52 is not required for this project
per Section 15162, which exempts project CEQA documents that do not require public review.17

Native American Sacred Lands File Search

A Sacred Lands File search for the project site was submitted to the Native American Heritage
Commission (NAHC) on November 11, 2017 (included as Appendix G).18 The results of the NAHC Sacred
Lands File Search showed tribal cultural resources exist at the project site or its vicinity. Tribes have
been notified of the project as recommended by the NAHC. As previously discussed, the project will
implement Mitigation Measure 7-2, thus, protecting previously unrecorded or unknown cultural
resources, including Native American artifacts and human remains.

Applicable Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-2 would be required and would remain adequate to mitigate
impacts as described in the Specific Plan EIR. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Conclusion

The Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated the potential impacts to prehistoric and archeological.
Project-specific research and Native American contact for the project has confirmed the Specific Plan EIR
adequately evaluated the potential tribal cultural resource impacts that would occur with
implementation of the project. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred,
and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified
has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the Specific
Plan EIR adequately evaluated impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new
or more severe impacts would occur.

17 As the Specific Plan EIR was certified prior to July, 2015, and as this Program EIR Checklist supports the findings
that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, there are no new or substantially more severe significant effects
and mitigation required, the project is within scope and is not subject to AB 52.
### 3.18 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>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) 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 stormwater 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>

### Discussion

The Specific Plan EIR determined water demand would increase as a result of buildout of the Specific Plan. Average daily demand was projected to be 882,720 gallons per day (gpd), which represents approximately 0.38 percent of the water demand forecasted in the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for the year 2040.
The Specific Plan EIR also noted development within the Specific Plan area 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 East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) including consistency with the UWMP, and the requirement that new development pay a fair share of the costs associated with provision of water facilities as required by the City’s conditions of approval.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded that since development facilitated by the Specific Plan 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 would be less than significant.

The Specific Plan EIR concluded development associated with the Specific Plan would result in less-than significant impacts on utilities and service systems, including wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the Specific Plan EIR determined wastewater and storm drainage infrastructure systems would require improvements, including the upgrading of existing deficiencies, in order to accommodate new development facilitated by the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan EIR provided recommendations and design considerations for proposed infrastructure improvements.

The Stege Sanitary District provides wastewater service to properties along San Pablo Avenue, including the project site. This project applicant will participate in the San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

3. Project-Specific Condition of Approval: Applicant shall participate in the Stege Sanitary District’s San Pablo Avenue Sewer Capacity Improvement Fee Program.

The Specific Plan EIR determined that significant, unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impacts would result from construction of the identified infrastructure improvements required to meet the Specific Plan buildout capacity.

Dwelling units constructed under the project would fall within the total development anticipated in the Specific Plan EIR. As such, the project would not increase demand on the wastewater infrastructure beyond that analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. Given this, the project would not result in any impacts from expanded utility infrastructure beyond what was identified in the Specific Plan EIR.

The increase in commercial and residential density under the Specific Plan would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste generated within the Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan EIR concluded the increase in solid waste generation would not exceed acceptable rates established by plans, policies, and regulation. Solid waste generated by the occupation and operation of Specific Plan development would be served by solid waste and recycling facilities with sufficient long-term capacities to accommodate residential and commercial development of the Specific Plan development, including the project. Solid
waste in El Cerrito is collected by the East Bay Sanitary Company and processed at the Golden Bear Transfer Station in Richmond. After processing, landfill materials are transferred to the Keller Canyon Landfill in Contra Costa County. As such, solid waste impacts were determined to be less than significant.

Pacific Gas & Electricity would provide gas and electric services to the project site and EBMUD would provide water services.\textsuperscript{19,20}

\textbf{Applicable Mitigation}

The Specific Plan EIR did not identify any mitigation measures for utility impacts. Implementation of the project-specific condition of approval would be required, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The project is consistent with the type of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the Specific Plan EIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures, beyond implementation of the project-specific condition of approval, would be required. The project would not result in new significant or more severe impacts related to utilities. Therefore, the Specific Plan EIR adequately evaluated the utilities and service systems impacts of the project and no new impacts related to utilities would result.

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
4 Reference Documents


Technical Appendices

The following resources were prepared in order to further identify project specific parameters. Copies of these technical documents are incorporated herein by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the City of El Cerrito.

B. JRP, 2017. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Historical Resource Assessment for the Property at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, Contra Costa County, California and CHRIS search results.
DESIGN REVIEW Tier II Staff Report
June 6, 2018
10135 San Pablo Avenue

DETAILS

Application Number: PL16-0005

Applicant: Tom Zhang, LZI International

Location: 10135 San Pablo Avenue

APN: 510-034-001, and 002

Zoning: Transit-Oriented Higher -Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

General Plan: Transit-Oriented Higher -Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU)

Request: Design Review Board consideration of Tier II Design Review, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, for a new 6-story building containing 72 residential units, and 4,413 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 was reviewed by the Design Review Board in a study session on December 6, 2017, where specific comments were provided to enhance the proposed architecture, design, and the location of public art and open space. The specific comments are included on pages 4 and 5 of the staff report.

The proposed plans have been revised to reflect the comments of the Design Review Board. As the project was not continued to a specific date, the project has been noticed for June 6, 2018.

The project requires Tier II Design Review approval from the Design Review Board, and 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

The building features contemporary design elements along the San Pablo Avenue and Avila Street elevations consisting of brick red and light gray stucco, steel cable for railings, and fiber cement board on the inside of the balcony areas. Bronze anodized aluminum casement windows will be installed for the residential units. 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 at the southwest corner of San Pablo Avenue and Avila Street cul-de-sac. The site is comprised of two parcels (APNs 510-034-001 and 002) and is generally level. The combined site is a total of 21,809 square feet (0.50 acres). The shape of the two parcels creates a reversed L, with the long side of the two parcels facing San Pablo Avenue, and is 150 feet long. The northern property line is 100 feet wide; at the southern end, this depth is 150 feet. The project site is within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, and has the Transit-Oriented Higher-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) zoning designation.

Vicinity Map

Existing Public Right-of-Way

The site has 150 feet of street frontage along San Pablo Avenue. It also has a 16 foot wide driveway that connects onto Avila Street. In September 1984, the City Council approved a 100 feet long street vacation for the eastern portion of Avila Avenue. This vacation was approved to allow the maximum development potential of the site to the north of 10135 San Pablo Avenue (at 10175 San Pablo Avenue). When a street was vacated, it is removed from the operation and maintenance as a public street, and the adjacent property owners are both given half of the street width to incorporate into their existing property. The project proposes to incorporate an enhanced mid-block path into its site plan that will
formally connect Avila Street to San Pablo Avenue for pedestrian use, in accordance with the Active Transportation and Urban Greening Plan.

The site is accessible to public transportation and amenities, as south and north bound AC Transit RAPID bus stops are within 300 feet of the project site and on both sides of San Pablo Avenue. In addition, the El Cerrito Plaza BART station is within ½ mile of the site.

Existing/Previous Land Use

The project site is currently vacant, with a surface parking lot that formerly served as an automobile sales use. Vegetation on the project site consists of ruderal vegetation; streetscape landscaping, including street trees, and shrubs, mostly which exist along San Pablo Avenue.

Site Photo

![Site Photo]

Adjacent Land Uses

**North:** An informal pedestrian pathway between San Pablo Avenue and Avila Avenue is directly north of the project site. A quick serve restaurant is located to the north of the pedestrian pathway.

**East:** Commercial properties along San Pablo Avenue.

**South:** Vacant former automobile sales lot. A development application has been submitted for this property (10167 San Pablo Avenue and application PL17-006) that is under review by staff.

**West:** Residential uses. Carlson Boulevard is located to the west of the residences.
Analysis

Project Description

The proposed project consists of a building of 85,867 square foot containing 72 residential units, 4,413 square feet for commercial uses in four spaces, and 11,005 square feet for parking for automobiles, and bicycles. Vehicular access to the site is now proposed to enter from San Pablo Avenue using a two-way driveway. It is configured to allow right turns only into the site, and onto San Pablo Avenue. There are seven pedestrian entrances to the building: three along the northern elevation, facing the public open space area, and four along San Pablo Avenue. The main entrance for residents of the building is along the northern elevation of the building. The other two entrances along the northern elevation consist of a gated stairway at the western end of the building and an entrance to the commercial space that has access onto the proposed public plaza area. There is one access to the building through a gated fence at the southeastern corner of the building.

The ground floor parking area is behind and to the west of the commercial spaces. This area provides 45 parking spaces in a combination of surface parking and mechanical stacked parking spaces. Additionally, pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the parking is unbundled from the dwelling units. Parking for 114 long-term and 8 short-term bicycle spaces are included with the project, and are in the covered ground floor area.

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 Higher Intensity Mixed-Use (TOHIMU) 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 San Pablo Avenue, and is designated a Community 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><strong>Sidewalk Amenity Zone</strong></td>
<td>6 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Pedestrian Zone</strong></td>
<td>8 ft. min</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Activity Zone</strong></td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
<td>0 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Front Setback</strong></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><strong>Side Setback</strong></td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
<td>0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Setback</strong></td>
<td>See Shadows</td>
<td>Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Access</strong></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>4 entries to commercial spaces along San Pablo Avenue; 3 entries to the residential building access along the northern elevation; 1 access through a gate at the southeast corner of the parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Access</strong></td>
<td>Max 20 ft. 2-way driveways, minimum 100 feet apart. Side access on corner lots.</td>
<td>(1) 18 ft. two-way driveway on San Pablo Avenue</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>Building is setback in compliance with required shadow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td>14 ft. min clear</td>
<td>14 ft. min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Ceiling Height</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 ft. min clear</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 ft. min</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Length</strong></td>
<td><strong>200 ft. max</strong></td>
<td><strong>145 ft. along San Pablo Avenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td>Non-residential 75% min</td>
<td>75% for Shop Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Floor Transparency</strong></td>
<td><strong>30% min</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Encroachments</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 ft. max</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 ft.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Encroachments</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 ft. max</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 ft.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allowed Frontage Types</strong></td>
<td>Min: 50% Flex</td>
<td>Shop Front (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 50% Forecourt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 100% Shop Front, Arcade or Ecofront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Open Space Requirements</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
<th><strong>Provided</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private/Common Open Space</strong></td>
<td>80 sq. ft./unit min 72x80=5,760 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,264 provided. Overall surplus for the project of 1,504 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 2,146.67 sq. ft. required)</td>
<td>2,295 sq. ft. of public open space provided; surplus of 147.33 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transit-Oriented Higher Intensity Mixed Use Zone</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
<th><strong>Provided</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Parking</strong></td>
<td>Up to 1 spaces/unit (Reductions and increases allowed with Zoning Administrator approval)</td>
<td>0.57 spaces per unit (total of 41 new garage spaces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Parking</strong></td>
<td>Min 1 short-term space/10 units 72/10=7.2 (7) Residential 1.5x72=108</td>
<td>8 short-term spaces Surplus 1 space 114 long-term spaces Surplus 6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,413 sq. ft. = 2 short term</td>
<td>2 short-term commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Height</strong></td>
<td>65 ft. max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Height</strong></td>
<td>3 stories residential, 2 stories 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 Street standards prevail.*

### Design Review Process

Pursuant to Section 2.03.08.01.02.8 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

### Design Review Board Comments

The project was originally considered by the Design Review Board on December 6, 2017 where these specific comments were provided by the Board:

- Encourage the public art and public open space be relocated from the roof to the ground floor.
- Management of the rooftop open space and internal community room space needs to be more thought out.
- Create more landscaping adjacent to the walkway area that connects Avila Street to San Pablo Avenue to soften the pavement area; create a wider landscape area on either side of the walkway.
- Relocate the residential units to face San Pablo Avenue to take advantage of the view to the hills.
- Ensure that the plant species for the atrium area can be year round species; the planting depths for shrubs and trees should be deep enough (at least three feet) to support these materials.
- Ensure that the daylight plane is stepping back along the western elevation of the building.
- Pull the building away from the driveway along Avila Street; the building feels cramped.
- Use a double sided corridor floor plan.
- Consider using a flexible demising wall between the retail and restaurant space; make sure that the trash is vented, and grease interceptors are installed for the restaurant use.
- Specific comments regarding the elevations were provided by the Board to:
  - Provide a different color scheme.
- Use current materials for the façade; too much stucco.
- Establish reveals in the window pattern and expansion joists in stucco (if using).
- Create a thicker profile using vinyl VPI windows versus aluminum windows.
- Overall, be more exemplary with the proposed design.

The Board appreciated the tile and glass proposed at the retail level; however, it felt that more work was needed to create a more cohesive design.

Architecture

The architecture of the proposed building has been significantly revised and responds to the comments of the Design Review Board.

Instead of a building with hexagonal features, and articulations along the northern and eastern elevations using balconies, and a narrow separation between the units along the San Pablo Avenue elevation, the proposed building has a streamlined and contemporary look to it with a revised color scheme using stucco using a brick red and gray color scheme. Balconies will have a steel cable railing in a light gray, and a light gray fiber cement panel will be installed vertically within the balcony area to add interest to this space that is visible along San Pablo Avenue. There is a simplicity and presence to the appearance of the building that is reinforced with the rhythm of windows and balconies, especially along the San Pablo Avenue and from the Avila Street perspective. Additionally, there is a pattern in the stucco created by the expansion joists in this materials, and an offset or reveal with the installation of the aluminum windows for the residential windows. There is articulation at the roof level, as the roof is lowered at the balconies that face San Pablo Avenue. There’s a similarly lowered roof line along the northern elevation that faces the public plaza area. The project implements the daylight plane requirements along the western elevation, and there is a stair step design with balconies as the most western design element along this interface.

The floor plans now have the residential units facing San Pablo Avenue, which allow the residents to use the balconies, and view the hills to the east. Similarly, the units facing west have balconies that allow a view to the west and the San Francisco skyline as well as to the north and south depending upon the location of the unit. The building has been pulled away from Avila Street at the cul-de-sac area, and from the northern elevation with the creation of a new public plaza area. Access to the site for automobile traffic is now from San Pablo Avenue; no automobile traffic along Avila Street will occur with the proposed building, although the collection recycling/compost/trash materials will occur from Avila Street.

Staff believes the changes to the building incorporate the comments from the Design Review Board, and establish a more coherent design theme for the proposed building.
Public Open Space

A significant change to the type and location of the public space has occurred with the revisions to the proposed project. The public open space is located adjacent to the existing walkway along the northern elevation of the site, and now takes advantage of the walkway with an enhanced area that allows for seating, whether by residents of the building or adjacent area, or customers of the potential coffee shop space. Additionally, there are two locations for public art in this area: one area near the main entrance to the building, and one closer to San Pablo Avenue. This new public plaza area allows for a pedestrian and bicycle connection from Avila Street to San Pablo Avenue, which meets the intent of the Urban Greening Plan for creating new a pocket park area this location along an active commercial corridor. Finally, the main lobby for the residential building also uses this public plaza area as its formal entrance into the building.

Landscape Design

Overall, the new landscape plan is found to be acceptable, in terms of design and plant species. A row of six (6) Brisbane Box trees, 48 inch box trees, are the focal point for the landscaping in this area as these will be installed in a permanent planter area. Oregon Grape is to be planted underneath these trees as an accent material. At the western end of the plaza area, five (5) 15 gallon Coyote Brush shrubs are to be planted and will be enhanced with the installation of five (5) Swan Hill olive trees. Six (6) movable planters are to be installed with Coffeeberry. Both of these tree species are evergreen, with dense canopies.
Staff does have a few concerns regarding the species and size of the proposed trees as well as a space allotted for the Violet Trumpet Vine. A condition of approval has been included that the final landscape plan will be reviewed by an outside consultant to be hired by the City and paid for by the applicant to ensure that the species and size of plants to be installed will be appropriate for the location. Another condition of approval will be that the bioretention areas must be compliant with the state Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (WELO), which includes access to these areas for maintenance.

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 two sculptural elements in the public open space area on ground floor of the new public plaza area on the site: one in front of the main entry of the residential building, and one closer towards San Pablo Avenue.

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. Estimated* West Contra Costa Unified School District fee of $5.02 per square foot are assessed on gross square footage of the project (85,867 sq. ft. x 5.02= $431,052.34). This money is collected by the School District to help fund both modernization and new construction of school facilities.

2. Estimated* West County Sub Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP Fee) of $1,648 per multi-family dwelling unit. (72 du x $1,648=$118,656.00). 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 $549,708.34.

*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.
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 May 16, 2018. No comments have been received as of the publish date of this report.

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 with entries into the building along the public open space for the major access point into the residential units. Additionally, there are four entry points into the commercial spaces along San Pablo Avenue, and landscaping improvements in an area that will be the public open space/plaza area for the project. 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 open space area to the south of the existing walkway has been created to activate pedestrian activity along this walkway, and to create a gathering spot for residents of the proposed building as well as the existing Avila Street and other area 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. The project creates a relationship to the variety of small retail uses (oil change service and quick food restaurant to the north, and the Peppermint Tree Plaza on the east side of San Pablo Avenue), and other retailers*
that exist adjacent to the intersection of San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue. 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 72 new residential units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the two El Cerrito BART stations. The project includes 114 bike parking spaces as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will provide a pleasant pedestrian environment along the public walkway to the north of the proposed building.

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

The project is located on an undeveloped and vacant site. The proposed project will provide 72 new housing units, 4,413 square feet in ground floor commercial space, 45 vehicle parking spaces and 114 bicycle parking spaces in close proximity to public transit.

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

The applicant proposes to add 72 new residential units to an underdeveloped parcel. Additionally, a new outdoor public open space area, and public art will enhance the proposed project. Private open space is proposed with balconies and a sixth floor deck space.

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

The project will provide 72 new residential units by converting an existing undeveloped, and unused 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 72 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 west, north, and south 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 features pedestrian and bicycle access onto the public open space area, and San Pablo Avenue. A main door from the walkway and public open space area provides lobby access to the residential units. Commercial space is located along San Pablo Avenue; the Manager’s Office is on the mezzanine, and overlooks the public open space and walkway area. 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 balconies for most of the units, and an open west facing roof deck on the sixth floor, which is adjacent to a fitness room, and two multi-function rooms for the use of the residents.*
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 trees and landscaping material will be installed in the new public open space/plaza area along the northern elevation of the building. Two existing planter areas along San Pablo Avenue will need to be shortened in order to allow for the new driveway for the building.

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 plan palate includes native, drought-tolerant plans such as Brisbane Box, Oregon Grape, Coyote Brush, Coffeeberry, Swan Hill olive trees, and Violet Trumpet Vine.

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 the northern elevation via the public walkway, 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 72 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 Avenue and features pedestrian and bicycle access onto this street with a main entrance from the public walkway and lobby access to the residential units along the building’s northern elevation.

**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 Higher-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 II 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. PL16-0005, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.
Proposed Motion
Move adoption of Design Review Board Resolution DRB 18-05 granting Tier II Design Review approval to Planning Application No. PL16-0005, a project that includes a 6-story residential building containing 72 dwelling units located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue.

Appeal Period
Within ten (10) calendar 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 and CEQA Appendices
3. Updated Project Plans, dated May 17, 2018
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 72 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT 10135 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 Higher-Intensity Mixed Use;

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

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site are 510-034-001, and 002;

WHEREAS, on January 26, 2016, the applicant submitted an application for Tier II Design Review;

WHEREAS, on September 26, 2017, the applicant was determined to be complete; and

WHEREAS, on June 6, 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 the standards for the Transit-Oriented Higher-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. PL16-0005, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Division:

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans dated May 17, 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. 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.

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.
11. Prior to the issuance of a building or demolition permit the Applicant/Developer shall submit a notice containing the following information to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator. (text shown in quotes shall be reproduced verbatim on the notice.) Once approved, the text on this notice shall be transferred onto a 6 foot by 3 foot sign on the project site’s construction fence. This temporary sign shall be made of weather resistant materials and remain in place for the duration of the construction of the project.

   a. “Emergency contact number: 9-1-1”. “This number should only be used in case of fire or criminal activity is observed.”

   b. “Urgent contact numbers:”
      “These numbers should be used for urgent issues such as dust and noise concerns.”
      The telephone number and name of person to contact (construction liaison) that is authorized to address urgent concerns on the project team’s team. “This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours of receipt of complaint.”

   c. The Air District’s phone number:
      “Bay Area Air Quality Management District: 1-800-334-ODOR (6367) for any issue related to dust and/or air quality”

   d. The number of the “Development Service Manager in El Cerrito (510) 215-4332 if any community member has questions or concerns regarding the project.”

   e. A color rendering of the new project that has been approved for construction along with a brief, factual project description. An interested party contact is also allowed in this section of the notice.

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

12. 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.

13. 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**

**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.

14. **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.

15. 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

16. **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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. 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 adjourn 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.

23. 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 cause 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
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:**

24. The project design shall implement the following measures to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less, in compliance with City noise standards:

**Interior Noise Control Measures**

- Exterior finishes shall have a minimum STC rating of 46
- Residential doors and windows along the eastern façade shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 30
- Residential doors and windows along the northern façade within 150 feet of San Pablo Avenue shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
- All residential doors and windows along the southern façade shall have a minimum STC rating of 28
- Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residential units on the project site so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant’s discretion to control interior noise and achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn or less

As an alternative to the above-listed interior noise control measures, the Applicant may provide a detailed acoustical analysis of interior noise control measures once building plans become available. The analysis should 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.

25. Mechanical equipment shall be selected and designed to reduce impacts on surrounding uses to meet the City’s 60 dBA Leq daytime and 56 dBA Leq nighttime noise level requirements at the property line of nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further noise reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, selection of equipment that emits low noise levels and/installation of noise barriers, such as enclosures and parapet walls, to block the line-of-sight between the noise source and the nearest receptors. Alternate measures may include locating equipment in less noise-sensitive areas, such as the rooftop of the building away from the building’s edge nearest the noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible.

26. The Applicant shall ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the adjacent crosswalk by installing mirrors on both sides of the driveway to aid drivers’ and pedestrians’ visibility and install flashing lights to alert pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting the driveway.
27. Chain link fencing is permitted only as construction fencing.

28. The final landscape plan will be reviewed by an outside Consultant, hired by the City, and paid for by the applicant to ensure that the species and size of plants to be installed will be appropriate for the location.

29. The bioretention areas must be compliant with the state Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (WELO), which includes access to these areas for maintenance. These plans will be reviewed by the outside Consultant.

**Public Works Department:**

30. 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.

31. Storm water control plan and all C.3 measures shall be re-submitted with the Building Plan set to confirm that the plans dated April 24, 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/).

32. 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, 10ft from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties.

33. For any work in the Public Right-of-Way, street cuts, street tree, sidewalk, curb & gutter, and driveway work, Applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

34. Prior to issuance of building permit, the project Applicant shall pay a fair share contribution towards the implementation of the multi-modal Complete Streets improvements identified by the Specific Plan as determined by the Public Works Director.

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

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

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

38. 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.

39. 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.
40. 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.

41. 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:

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

Fire Department:

43. 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 120v powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

Police Department
44. 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:
   45. This applicant shall pay all applicable sewer connection fees pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Stege Sanitary District Ordinance Code.

East Bay Sanitary:
   46. Construction of the new trash room shall be 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 June 6, 2018, upon motion of Commissioner _____________, second by Commissioner _____________:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Elizabeth Dunn
Consulting Planner
MEMORANDUM

DATE:          May 25, 2018

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

FROM:          Kyle Simpson, Associate/Project Manager
                Judith Malamut, AICP, Principal

SUBJECT:       California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Exemption Memorandum for the 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project, El Cerrito, California

This memorandum and attachments provide a description of the proposed 10135 San Pablo Avenue 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 0.5-acre project site is located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The proposed project would involve demolition of an existing vacant surface parking lot on the site and construction of a new six-story mixed-use building with five floors for multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor. The building would include 72 dwelling units; 4,413 square feet of retail space; 45 covered parking spaces; and ground level public open space.

Attachment A provides a description of the proposed project. This attachment includes a description of the project, 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 10135 San Pablo Avenue 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.
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ATTACHMENT A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
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1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following describes the proposed 10135 San Pablo Avenue 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 0.5-acre (21,809-square-foot) project site is located at 10135 San Pablo Avenue in the City of El Cerrito, Contra Costa County. The site is bounded by San Pablo Avenue to the east, a quick-service food restaurant and Central Avenue to the south, single-family and multi-family homes and Carlson Boulevard to the west, and a recently re-opened quick-service food restaurant and Avila Street to the north.

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 Plaza Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station is located approximately 0.2 miles east of the site.

Figure 1-1 shows the site’s regional and local context. Figure 1-2 depicts an aerial photograph of the project site and surrounding land uses.

1.1.2 Site Characteristics and Current Site Conditions

The project site is generally level and consists of two parcels, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 510-034-001 and 510-034-002. The project site is currently developed with a surface parking lot that formerly served as an automobile sales lot. Vegetation within the project site includes ruderal vegetation and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs along San Pablo Avenue. Existing site conditions are depicted in Figure 1-3.

1.1.3 Existing General Plan and Zoning

The project site is designated Transit-Oriented High-Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) in the City’s General Plan, and the zoning designation is also TOHIMU. The TOHIMU designation allows for mixed use development with a 65-foot height limit.
FIGURE 1-1

10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project
Project Location and Regional Vicinity Map
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FIGURE 1-2

10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project
Aerial Photograph of Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses

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 (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. Between the project site and Carlson Boulevard to the west of the project site, are several single-family and multi-family residential units. A vacant portable office structure and a recently re-opened quick-service restaurant are located to the south between the project site and Central Avenue. A pedestrian pathway between San Pablo Avenue and Avila Street is located directly north of the project site. A vacant quick-service restaurant building is located north of the pedestrian pathway and it adjoins auto-oriented retail uses.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

This section provides a description of the proposed project as identified in the materials provided by LZI International (the project applicant) dated May 17, 2018. The project applicant proposes to develop the site with a new six-story mixed-use building with five floors for multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor. The building would include 72 dwelling units; 4,413 square feet of retail space; 45 covered parking spaces; and ground level public open space.

---

1.2.1 Building Program

The project would result in the construction of a six-story residential building with 72 market-rate apartment units and ground-level parking and street-facing commercial space. Figures 1-4 and 1-5 depict the overall conceptual site plan and first floor site plan for the proposed project. Figure 1-6 through Figure 1-10 show the proposed floor plans for the second through sixth floor, respectively. Figure 1-11 shows the proposed roof plan. Figures 1-12 and 1-13 show the conceptual elevations of the proposed building.

As shown in Figure 1-4, four retail stores are proposed to be constructed totaling 4,413 square feet. A separate ADA bathroom would be provided for each retail space, and one of the four retail spaces would be made ready for a restaurant operation with dedicated kitchen ventilation to the roof. In addition to the retail uses, a residential entrance lobby would be located on the ground floor which would be accessible from the north side of the proposed building, and a parking garage would be located behind the retail uses.

The residential entrance and residential lobby would be located at the northern end of the building on the ground floor. A mezzanine level would be accessible from the residential lobby and would include a leasing office. A total of 72 dwelling units are proposed with 42 two-bedroom/two-bathroom units, 26 one-bedroom/one-bathroom units, and 4 two-bedroom/one-bathroom units. Two elevators and two stairways would serve all residential units on levels two through six. The elevators and one stairway would be accessed from the residential lobby. The second stairway would be located at the southern end of the project site and would provide access from the parking garage. An exterior walkway would be located along the western edge of the project site on the second level, and would provide access from the south stairway to an access stairway at the north end of the project site. Common open space areas would be located on the second and sixth floors each including landscaping and sitting areas.

1.2.2 Open Space and Landscaping

The project would include 2,295 square feet of ground level public open space located at the northern end of the project site. The public open space would include tables, chairs, benches, public art and planters, and potted vegetation, as shown in Figure 1-14. The project would also include 2,054 square feet of common open space on the second floor (shown in Figure 1-15), and 991 square feet of common open space on the sixth floor (shown in Figure 1-15). The common open space would be accessible to residents and would include sitting areas and planters. In addition, private open space in the form of balconies and decks attached to residential units would total 4,219 square feet.

1.2.3 Access, Circulation, and Parking

A secured parking garage would be located on the ground floor behind the retail space. As shown in Figure 1-5, primary automobile access to the project site would occur through a proposed 18-foot two-way private driveway from San Pablo Avenue to the garage. The driveway would be restricted to right-in/right-out only, due to the existing landscaped median on San Pablo Avenue. A public walkway on the north side of the project would provide non-motorized access between Avila Street and San Pablo Avenue.
FIGURE 1-11

10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project
Proposed Roof Floor Plan

SOURCE: LZI INTERNATIONAL, MARCH 2018.
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FIGURE 1-15

SECOND FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN

SIXTH FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN

10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project
Proposed Landscape Plan, Second Floor and Sixth Floor

SOURCE: LZI INTERNATIONAL, MARCH 2018.
The project would include 45 automobile parking spaces of various types including shared, stacked, and unbundled parking spaces. Of the 45 automobile parking spaces located in the garage, 40 parking spaces would be mechanical stacked parking spaces, and the remaining five surface-parking spaces would be provided with electrical vehicle charging stations. Two of the five surface parking spaces would be ADA-compliant.

For residential uses, eight short-term bicycle parking spaces and 114 long-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided, and located in the parking garage. For retail uses, two short-term bicycle spaces would be provided and located along San Pablo Avenue, and eight long-term bicycle spaces would be provided in the parking garage.

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 through 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 8-inch collector main along Central Avenue that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between El Dorado Street and Central Avenue. 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 20,000 square feet of the 22,000-square-foot project site. The project would incorporate a variety of low impact development stormwater treatment facilities including bio-filtration plants for stormwater treatment and discharge and bay-friendly landscaping that would use a selection of native and drought-tolerant plants.

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 natural gas line runs under 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
- EBMUD water connection approval
- Stege Sanitary District, District-wide and SPASP-specific per fixture sewer connection charges
- 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 10135 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 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 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development 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 10135 San Pablo Avenue Development Project is exempt from 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, 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 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 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 approximately 0.5-acre project site is currently developed with a surface parking lot that formerly served as an automobile sales lot. Vegetation on the site is limited to ruderal vegetation and streetscape landscaping including trees and shrubs along San Pablo Avenue. The proposed project would demolish and remove the existing surface pavements on the site and construct a six-story, mixed-use residential apartment building as well as associated open space and landscaping, circulation and parking, and infrastructure improvements. The new building would include five floors of multi-family residential units above a commercial ground floor and ground-floor parking garage and public open space.

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 SPAS.

The primary potentially significant impact to scenic resources identified in the SPAS FEIR was the potential for implementation of the SPAS 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). While this impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable; the Specific Plan EIR 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 of east-west streets that run east and west, as well as, from the BART platforms. The project applicant modeled the views from the platform of the El Cerrito Plaza BART station, with the addition of the project, as shown in Figure 2-1. These images show that the project will not have an impact on views to the west of elements identified in the Specific Plan (Albany Hill, Mount Tamalpais, the Golden Gate Bridge, and the San Francisco skyline) for the following reasons:

• The project site is located within the southwestern portion of the City, which has a lower elevation and denser development.

• Streets that run east and west with potential to be within the viewshed of the project include Central Avenue, Lincoln Avenue, and Avila Street. Due to the surrounding topography, existing views toward the project site from Central Avenue and Eureka Avenue are obscured by the elevated BART tracks and existing trees. Views toward the East Bay Hills from Avila Street may be affected by the project. However, views of the East Bay Hills will still be possible from the public right-of-way of Avila Street after development of the project.

• The Specific Plan limits building lengths to 200 feet in order to preserve intermittent views. The project would be less than 200 feet in length.

In accordance with Mitigation Measure 4-1 of the SPAS FEIR, it should be noted that the proposed project would develop a new six-story building that is approximately 65 feet in height which could alter views of the East Bay Hills from the residences immediately surrounding the project site. The proposed project is located within the SPAS’s Transit-Oriented Higher Intensity Mixed Use (TOHIMU) zone, which allows building heights of up to 65 feet (85 feet for affordable housing projects). The proposed project would be within the allowable height limit established within the SPAS and would therefore be consistent with the conclusions of the SPAS FEIR. Furthermore, the SPAS 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 SPAS 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.
Figure 2-1: Visual Simulations

Photo 1: View from El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Platform - Northern End

Photo 2: View from El Cerrito Plaza BART Station Platform - Southern End
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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 4-1 and 4-2, are required.

2.1.3 Conclusion

The project is generally consistent with the type and intensity of development analyzed in the Specific Plan EIR, is within the allowable height and length limits, would be consistent with policies related to visual character and design, and would not result in a substantial increase in light and glare. No substantial changes in environmental circumstances have occurred, and no new information that could not have been known at the time the SPASP FEIR was certified has been identified which would lead to new or more severe significant impacts. Therefore, the SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated visual resource impacts that would occur with implementation of the project and no new or more severe impacts would occur.
2.2 AGRO-CULTURAL 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.

---


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 criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative 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 high-intensity, transit-oriented residential and commercial 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.

As identified in Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project would generate fewer vehicle trips than the uses assumed for this project site 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 (µg/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.

Sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. 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. Enhanced control measures recommended by the BAAQMD in Mitigation Measure 5-2 would also be implemented. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 5-1 and 5-2, 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 could include sensitive receptors, as well as new non-residential land uses that would be potential new emissions sources. 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 70 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 5.983 in 1 million, which is below the threshold of 10 in 1 million. The maximum chronic Hazard Index would be 0.007 and the maximum acute Hazard Index would be 0.016, 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 0.074 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. The proposed 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.

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, beyond implementation of SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1, are required.

2.4.3 Conclusion
The proposed project would be consistent with the type of development analyzed within the SPASP FEIR. Tree removal activities would be conducted in conformance with SPASP Mitigation Measure 6-1. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</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 two cultural resources within the 0.25-mile of the project site. There are no reports of previous cultural resource investigations of the project site on file at the NWIC.

The Directory of Properties for Contra Costa County, published by the State Office of Historic Preservation, lists two buildings near the project site at 10102 San Pablo Avenue and 10116 San Pablo Avenue. The Office of Historic Preservation has assigned these two resources a status code of “7R”, indicating that these buildings have been identified as part of a historical resource survey but have not been evaluated for their eligibility for listing in either the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources. Neither of the two buildings is directly adjacent to the project site, nor would they be directly affected by construction or operation of the proposed project.

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>Potential 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>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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\(^4\) was prepared for the proposed project, included as Appendix B, and determined that development of the proposed project is suitable on the project site and also provided earthwork and foundation recommendations for use in design and construction of the project site. These recommendations would be incorporated in the proposed project to ensure that impacts 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 recommendation from the Geotechnical Report. 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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
<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>
<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 mixed-use development in close proximity to transit. 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. The project site is not identified as a cleanup site but is located adjacent to a Leaking Underground Storage Site (LUST), at 3160 Carlson Blvd. However, the cleanup of this site has been completed and the case is now closed.

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, paint, 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 Fairmont Elementary School located 0.4 miles north of the project site, Harding Elementary School located 0.6 miles east of the project site, and El Cerrito High School located 0.6 miles east 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 29 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.

6 Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission, 2010. Oakland International Airport, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Figure 3-2. 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, and it is included in Appendix C. 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 by replacing existing impervious surfaces on the site with pervious surfaces including bio-filtration plants for stormwater treatment and discharge and bay-friendly landscaping that would use a selection of native and drought-tolerant plants at the ground level as well as on the roof garden. The project would increase pervious surface coverage from approximately 1,773 square feet to approximately 6,265 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>☐</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>

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 TOHIMU in the City’s General Plan and SPASP. In addition, the site is also zoned as TOHIMU. The intent of the TOHIMU designation is to provide for a vibrant, walkable, transit-oriented higher density area within 0.5 miles of BART that allows a variety of uses including retail, commercial, residential, and public uses in the Downtown and Uptown areas. The TOHIMU
designation allows for a 65-foot height limit (85 feet is permissible for affordable housing projects) and requires a minimum height limit of three stories for residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the mix, intensity, and scale of development contemplated by the SPASP in this location.

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)\(^9\) 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 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, operational noise from adjacent uses (e.g., nearby parking lot noise and pedestrians) is audible on the project site.

---

As identified in the Noise Memorandum, to assess existing noise levels, LSA conducted a short-term (15-minute) and a long-term noise measurement (24-hour) measurement at different on-site locations. The short-term measurement was conducted at 1:46 p.m. on October 4, 2017. The long-term measurement was conducted from October 3, 2017 to October 4, 2017. The short-term noise measurement indicates that ambient noise in the project site vicinity is approximately 63.2 dBA Leq. The long-term noise measurement indicates that noise levels on the project site are approximately 64.1 dBA Ldn.

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 closest sensitive receptors include the adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site.

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 as traffic on San Pablo Avenue, nearby parking lot noise, and pedestrians. Noise levels on the project site measured approximately 64.1 dBA Ldn at the center of the project site, approximately 140 feet west of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue. The proposed residences would be located within 70 feet of the centerline of San Pablo Avenue; therefore, when adjusted for distance, the proposed residences would be exposed to a noise level of approximately 70.1 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 is 60 dBA Ldn. Noise levels of 60 to 75 dBA Ldn are considered conditionally acceptable when a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements and noise insulation features are included in the design to meet the interior noise standard. 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.

**Interior Noise Analysis.** Based on the site plans for the proposed project, calculations were completed for the bedrooms located on the northeast corner of the property with the largest window-to-wall ratio. The calculations assume typical stucco construction and two walls exposed to traffic noise. The results of the analysis show an approximate 29 dBA exterior-to-interior noise reduction. These calculations (shown in Appendix D) assume a wall rating of STC-46 and window rating of STC-28. With windows closed, interior noise levels at the guest rooms would be approximately 41.1 dBA (i.e., 70.1 dBA - 29 dBA = 41.1 dBA), which is below the 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard with windows closed for noise-sensitive land uses. Therefore, with standard building
construction, central air conditioning allowing windows to remain closed, and windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 or higher, noise impacts associated with traffic would meet the City’s normally acceptable interior noise level criterion of 45 dBA.

**Instantaneous Noise Analysis.** The short-term noise measurement indicated a maximum instantaneous noise level of 71.2 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$. With windows and doors closed, maximum instantaneous noise levels would be approximately 46.2 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ (i.e., $71.2 - 25 = 46.2$). 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 70.1 dBA $L_{\text{dn}}$. This noise level would be within the City’s conditionally acceptable noise level of 60 to 75 dBA $L_{\text{dn}}$ for residential land uses when noise reduction requirements and noise insulation features are included in the design to meet the interior noise standard. As noted above, interior noise levels would meet the City’s standards with the project-specific noise reduction measures outlined above. Therefore, the project would meet the City’s land use compatibility standards.

**2.12.1.2 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. Typical noise levels generated by loading and unloading would be similar to noise levels generated by truck movements on local roadways. Mechanical equipment would also have the potential to generate noise and would be a potential noise impact. 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, including other stationary source, is provided below.

Implementation of the proposed project would generate various on-site stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment, parking lot activities, and loading dock operations. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project are the adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site.

HVAC equipment is typically the primary noise source associated with residential and some commercial 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. Some off-site noise-sensitive receptors would be within 20 feet of 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 59 dBA $L_{max}$ generated by HVAC equipment. This noise level is lower than the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 $L_{max}$ during the day and 60 dBA $L_{max}$ 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.

Parking lot noise, including engine sounds, car doors slamming, car alarms, loud music, and people conversing, would occur as a result of the proposed project at the project site and on nearby streets. Typical parking lot activities, such as people conversing or doors slamming, generates approximately 60 dBA to 70 dBA $L_{max}$ at 50 feet. Existing sensitive receptors are located approximately 20 feet from the proposed parking garage. The parking garage would be enclosed; therefore, the building structure would provide a 15 dBA reduction in noise. Accounting for the enclosure, and when adjusted for distance, the nearest off-site residences would be exposed to a noise level of 53 to 63 dBA $L_{max}$ generated by parking lot activities. This noise level would not exceed the City’s maximum allowable noise level standards of 70 $L_{max}$ during the day and 60 dBA $L_{max}$ during the night. The nearest residential receptors have wood fences, which would reduce noise levels by an additional 5 dBA approximately. Therefore, parking lot noise associated with the proposed project would not be expected to substantially increase noise levels.

Additional on-site stationary noise sources would include delivery trucks and loading noise. Of the on-site stationary noise sources, noise generated by delivery truck activity would generate the highest maximum noise levels. Delivery truck loading and unloading activities would result in maximum noise levels from 75 dBA to 85 dBA $L_{max}$ at 50 feet. There are generally two types of loading that would occur on the site: small deliveries like parcels and packages, and large deliveries such as retail items. The former are typically made via passenger car, van, or single-unit truck. These activities are potential noise sources that could affect noise-sensitive receptors in the project site vicinity. Based on the site plans for the proposed project, loading areas would occur within the enclosed garage, which would shield the adjacent residences from loading dock and delivery noise.

In addition, peak noise levels from loading and unloading would be intermittent and when averaged over a one hour period would be much lower than the peak noise levels. In accordance with Mitigation Measure 13-2, as identified in the SPASP FEIR, to reduce loading dock and delivery noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors, design considerations and shielding must be implemented to ensure that the loading and delivery activities are located in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between loading- and delivery-related noise sources and nearest off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, noise-generating activities, such as maintenance activities and loading and unloading activities, are reduced to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

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 670 daily vehicle trips, with 25 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 47 trips occurring during the PM peak hour, which is less than what was identified for this project site in the SPASP FEIR. 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.

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 adjacent single- and multi-family residences, located approximately 15 feet from the project site. At 15 feet, there would be an

increase of approximately 8 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 94 dBA Lmax 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.

The proposed project is located over 1,000 feet west of BART; therefore, the proposed project would be exposed to significant groundborne vibration associated with BART and would not result in any new or more significant 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 15 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 form aircraft noise sources.

2.12.2 Applicable Mitigation

The proposed project would result in an increase in people living close to San Pablo Avenue which could expose sensitive receptors to higher noise levels from traffic. However, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to noise levels above normally acceptable levels with standard building construction, central air conditioning allowing windows to remain closed, and windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 28 or higher installed in the proposed residential units. In addition, 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. Implementation of these measures, as detailed in project-specific conditions of approval, 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 13-2, 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 the project-specific noise reduction measures outlined above and SPASP Mitigation Measures 13-2, 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,</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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></th>
<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*</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,840*</td>
<td>2,446a</td>
<td>162b</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of El Cerrito, 2018.

* 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

Would the project:

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:

   i. Fire protection?
   ii. Police protection?
   iii. Schools?
   iv. Parks?
   v. Other public facilities?

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 concluded that the impacts to parks and recreation would be less than significant with compliance with plan provisions for new open spaces. The proposed project includes 2,295 square feet of public open space. 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.

The project would include approximately 2,295 square feet of public open space and public art located on the ground level. In addition, the project would provide approximately 7,264 square feet of common and private open space in the form of a central courtyard and walkway on the second floor and private decks and balconies. 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 and public art 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>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No New Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

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? □ □ □ ✗

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? □ □ □ ✗

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? □ □ □ ✗

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? □ □ □ ✗

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? □ □ □ ✗

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? □ □ □ ✗
2.16.1 Discussion

This section compares traffic impacts from the proposed project with impacts identified in the SPASP FEIR. A Preliminary Transportation Analysis (TIA), included in Appendix E, 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.12

2.16.1.1 Trip Generation

Table 2.B presents the trip generation for the proposed project and the adjacent development located at 10167 San Pablo Avenue, and compares the trips generated to the assumptions provided in the SPASP FEIR. Using the same trip generation methodology used in the SPASP FEIR, it is estimated that the two projects would generate a total of 43 AM peak-hour and 75 PM peak-hour trips. The SPASP assumed 60 residential units and 12,000 square feet of commercial use for the site, which would generate 28 AM peak-hour and 67 PM peak-hour trips. The proposed project would generate 10 percent fewer trips in the AM and 30 percent fewer trips in the PM peak hours than assumed in the SPASP EIR. Thus, the two developments would generate 54 percent more trips in the AM peak hour and 12 percent more trips in the PM peak hour than assumed in the SPASP EIR.

The SPASP EIR assumed development of approximately 1,706 residential units and 243,100 square feet of commercial space throughout the SPASP area as part of the traffic analysis. Since the proposed project is within the SPASP area, this analysis also compares the total proposed, approved, and under construction projects as identified by the City,13 to the total increase in development analyzed in the EIR to ensure that the current projects combined would not exceed the SPASP EIR assumptions.

Since the certification of the SPASP EIR, 22 developments, including this proposed project, have been proposed and are in various stages of the City’s approval process. Table 2.C summarizes the total land uses for these developments, which includes 1,087 residential units and 65,571 square feet of commercial uses. The combined land uses for the proposed developments is less than the residential dwelling unit assumptions by 36 percent and is less than the commercial square footage assumptions by 73 percent as compared to the SPASP EIR land use assumptions. Thus, the proposed project combined with all planned, approved, and under construction projects in the SPASP area would not result in significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the SPASP EIR.

### Table 2.B: Project Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>Size&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Daily 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>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments</td>
<td>72 DU</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>4.0 KSF</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments</td>
<td>62 DU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Assumption (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartments</td>
<td>60 DU</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>12.0 KSF</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPASP Assumption (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>920</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Difference (C = A-B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup> KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit
<sup>b</sup> ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 223 (mid-rise apartments), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology. Daily Average Rate = 5.90 trips per DU; 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)
<sup>c</sup> ITE Trip Generation (9th Edition) land use category 820 (shopping center), adjusted by 12 percent based on the SPASP EIR trip generation methodology. Daily Average Rate = 37.60 trips per KSF; 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)

### 2.16.1.2 Vehicle Access and On-Site Circulation

Residents and visitors would access the site through a driveway on San Pablo Avenue. Vehicular access on San Pablo Avenue would be restricted to right-in/right-out only, due to the existing landscaped median on San Pablo Avenue. Northbound vehicles traveling to the site on San Pablo Avenue would make a U-turn on San Pablo Avenue at the intersection with El Dorado Street. Vehicles exiting the site intending to travel northbound on San Pablo Avenue would make a U-turn on San Pablo Avenue at Central Avenue.

The project would provide a total of 45 parking spaces. Four spaces on the ground-level garage would be dedicated for commercial uses, and 41 spaces would be dedicated for residential uses. The parking spaces would consist of three standard spaces, two ADA spaces, and 40 stacker spaces.

To ensure that vehicles exiting the site are restricted to right-turns only and to minimize traffic and sidewalk conflicts, the following project-specific condition of approval shall be implemented.

**Project-Specific Condition of Approval:**

Provide signing and striping at both the garage driveway and San Pablo Avenue driveway to restrict vehicles to right-turns only. This revision shall be incorporated on plans submitted for building permit issuance.

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific condition of approval, impacts associated with vehicle access and circulation would be less than significant.
Table 2.C: LAND USE COMPARISON FOR ALL PROPOSED PROJECTS IN THE SPASP AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use(^a)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (DU)</td>
<td>Commercial (KSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Projects(^b)</td>
<td>1,087 DU</td>
<td>65.6 KSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Assumed in SPASP EIR(^c)</td>
<td>1,706 DU</td>
<td>243.1 KSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) KSF = 1,000 square feet; DU = dwelling unit
\(^b\) Land use assumption details identified by the City in El Cerrito, El Cerrito San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area: Development Proposed, Under Construction or Recently Completed. Available online at: https://el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/7106/Development-Map_12_15_17.
\(^c\) Land use includes all projects analyzed in the SPASP, summarized in Appendix D of the SPASP EIR

2.16.1.3 Project Driveway Sight Distance

Adequate sight distance is defined as a clear line-of-sight between a motorist 10 feet back from the sidewalk and a pedestrian 10 feet away on each sides of the driveway. The project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not provide adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk south of the driveway. Additionally, vehicles parked on the north side of the San Pablo Avenue driveway may block the sight distance between vehicles exiting the driveway and vehicles on southbound San Pablo Avenue. Trees planted on the north side of the driveway may also affect sight lines of exiting vehicles if the tree canopy is lower than 6 feet from the ground.

To ensure that sight distance is adequate, the following project-specific conditions of approval shall be implemented.

*Project-Specific Condition of Approval:*

Consider revising the driveway design or providing mirrors at the driveway to ensure adequate sight distance between vehicles exiting the garage and pedestrians on the adjacent sidewalk south of the driveway.

Ensure that on-street parking and trees on the north side of the project driveway on San Pablo Avenue would not restrict sight distance for exiting vehicles by providing at least 10 feet of red curb and ensuring that the tree canopies are higher than six feet from the ground on the north side of the driveway.

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

2.16.1.4 Bicycle Parking, Access and On-Site Circulation

Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code requires bicycle parking for residential and commercial uses, as shown in Table 2.D. The project would consist of 72 residential units and 4,413
square feet of commercial space, requiring 9 short-term bicycle parking spaces (7 for residential and 2 for retail) and 109 long-term bicycle parking spaces (108 for residential and 1 for retail). The project would provide 10 short-term bicycle parking spaces; 8 short-term bicycle parking spaces for residents located in the parking garage, and 2 short-term bicycle parking spaces for retail users located in front of the retail spaces along San Pablo Avenue. The project would also provide 118 long-term parking spaces; 114 long-term bicycle parking spaces for residents and 4 long-term bicycle parking spaces for retail uses, all located in the parking garage. In total, the project would provide 10 short-term bicycle and 118 long-term parking spaces, exceeding City requirements. Pedestrians and cyclists would access the short-term and long-term garage bicycle parking via the residential lobby on the public walkway on the north side of the project.

To minimize potential conflicts between vehicles and cyclists, the following project-specific condition of approval shall be implemented.

Project-Specific Condition of Approval:

Relocate short-term bicycle parking from the garage to the sidewalk along San Pablo Avenue to improve parking visibility for cyclists and ensure proximity to the main entrance of the building.

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

2.16.1.5 Pedestrian Access and On-Site Circulation

Pedestrians would access the retail area via the entrances located on San Pablo Avenue and the public walkway to the north of the project. The residential entrance is located on the north side of the building, and provides access to the building lobbies, elevators, and staircases. The garage can be accessed by pedestrians using multiple entrances, including the lobby, the garage pedestrian entrance just west of the residential entrance on the public walkway, and a staircase and ramp on the south side of the project building with access on San Pablo Avenue.

The SPASP Form-Based Code (2.04.02) requires a minimum pedestrian zone of eight feet on all sidewalks along San Pablo Avenue. The project would provide eight feet of pedestrian zone for pedestrians along San Pablo Avenue, and the curb-cut for the garage driveway would not disrupt the pedestrian zone, meeting City requirements.

The multi-modal improvements identified in the SPASP include providing a midblock crosswalk on San Pablo Avenue, just north of Avila Street. As mentioned previously, the crosswalk would not be feasible with the proposed project driveway. 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.
Table 2.D: Bicycle Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Short-Term Spaces</th>
<th>Long-Term Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Rate a</td>
<td>Required Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Min. 2 spaces or 1 space/10 units, whichever is greater</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>KSF</td>
<td>Min 2. Spaces or 1.5 spaces/3,000 square feet, whichever is greater</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Required</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Proposed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Parking ratios based on Section 2.05.07.04 of the SPASP Form-Based Code.

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. One option is to participate in the payment of the City of El Cerrito Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), currently under development.

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

2.16.1.6 Transit Access

The El Cerrito Plaza BART station is located less than 0.5 miles east of the project site.

AC Transit provides bus service to the project site with bus stops on northbound and southbound San Pablo Avenue just north of Central Avenue, and on Central Avenue, just west of San Pablo Avenue. Both bus stops on San Pablo Avenue and Central Avenue provide a bench but do not include a bus shelter.

The multi-modal improvements identified in the SPASP include relocating the existing bus stop on southbound San Pablo Avenue from the near side (just north of intersection) to the far side (just south of intersection) at Central Avenue. As mentioned in Section 2.16.1.5, the project applicant will contribute to these improvements by making a fair share contribution to these improvements, such as paying the TIF, currently under development.

2.16.1.7 Parking and TDM Requirements

The proposed project would include a garage with 45 parking spaces. Based on the project site plan, 41 spaces would be designated for the residential component of the project and 4 spaces would be designated for the commercial component of the project. The parking spaces would be unbundled, and include 40 mechanically stacked parking spaces. The 45 parking spaces also include two ADA
spaces that are located near the entrance to the elevator lobby. The project also provides five parking spaces (10 percent of all parking spaces) with electric vehicle charging stations, meeting the Form Based Code requirement (Section 2.05.07.07).

The SPASP Form-Based Code requirements for the TOHIMU zoning district apply to the project site. TOHIMU zoning (Section 2.05.07.04) limits parking to a maximum of 1.0 automobile parking space per dwelling unit, a maximum of 1.0 space per 1,000 square feet of commercial space, and a basic Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan.

Table 2.E summarizes the code-required maximum and proposed parking for the project. The code would limit parking to a maximum of 72 off-street residential parking spaces and a maximum of four commercial spaces for the project. Based on the site plan dated May 17, 2018, the project would provide 41 residential parking spaces and four commercial spaces, meeting Code requirements.

The project is 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:

- Long-term and short-term bicycle parking that exceeds Code requirements
- Unbundled parking for residential units

With implementation of the above recommended project-specific conditions of approval and with implementation of the project-specific TDM requirements, impacts associated with parking code requirements would be less than significant.

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.
Table 2.E: Required Maximum and Proposed Parking

<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>73 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.4 KSF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Source: SPASP Form-Based Code Section 2.05.07.04 – TOHIMU Zone Off-Street Parking Requirements for Residential = max 1.0 space per DU and for commercial = max 1.0 space per 1,000 sf  
†† DU = dwelling unit

2.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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:
   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
   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.

2.17.1 Discussion

As previously discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources of this checklist, the SPASP FEIR determined that impacts to cultural and historic resources would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures 7-2 through 7-2. This finding applies to tribal cultural resources.

In addition, since certification of the SPASP FEIR, the California Legislature passed AB 52, which provides for consultation with Native American tribal organizations during the CEQA process.
Effective July 1, 2015, prior to the release of an environmental document for public review, a lead agency must provide the opportunity to consult with local tribes. However, because the SPASP FEIR was certified prior to July 1, 2015, and because this document supports the finding that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from further CEQA review and public review is not required for this document, the City is not required to conduct formal consultation under AB 52 for this project.

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 with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</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 water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, and solid waste disposal. However, the SPASP FEIR determined that the water, 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 a 10-inch collector main along Cutting Boulevard that collects flows along San Pablo Avenue between Knott Avenue and Cutting Boulevard. Per Section 7.3 of the SSD Ordinance Code, payment of a District-wide sewer connection/capacity charge and a SPASP-specific sewer connection/capacity charge to the District. The connection/capacity charges will fund sewer capacity improvements needed to serve projected growth within the SPSPA.

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

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.

2.18.3 Conclusion

The SPASP FEIR adequately evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SPASP, including utilities and infrastructure 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 related to utilities and infrastructure.
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TECHNICAL APPENDICES
TO ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

10135 SAN PABLO AVENUE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
EL CERRITO, CA

http://www.el-cerrito.org/DocumentCenter/View/10066/10135-SPA-Checklist-Appendices_May-2018
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, 10135 SAN PABLO AVE. EL CERRITO, CA 94530

APPLICABLE CODES
1. CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE 2016
2. CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE 2016
3. CALIFORNIA RESIDENTIAL CODE 2016
4. CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE 2016
5. CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE 2016
6. CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE 2016
7. CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE 2016
8. CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING STANDARD 2016
9. EL CERRITO CITY ORDINANCES

SCOPE OF WORK
TO CONSTRUCT A MIXED-USE MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COMPLEX WITH 45 PARKING SPACE, 4,413 S.F. RETAIL SPACE ON FIRST FLOOR, 72 UNITS ON SECOND TO SIXTH FLOORS. TOTAL BUILDING AREA IS 85,867 S.F.

DRAWING INDEX
A0.0 COVER SHEET
A0.1 ZONING INFORMATION
A1.0 SITE PLAN
A1.1 AREA PLAN
A2.0 FIRST AND MEZZANINE FLOOR PLAN
A2.1 SECOND AND THIRD FLOOR PLAN
A2.2 FOURTH AND FIFTH FLOOR PLAN
A2.3 SIXTH AND ROOF FLOOR PLAN
A5.0 EAST AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS
A5.1 WEST AND NORTH ELEVATIONS
A5.2 SECTION
L2.0 FIRST, SECOND AND SIXTH FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN
L3.0 ENLARGED FIRST LANDSCAPE PLAN
L4.0 FIRST, SECOND AND SIXTH FLOOR PLANTING PLAN
L5.0 FIRST, SECOND AND SIXTH FLOOR LIGHTING PLAN
L6.0 FIRST, SECOND AND SIXTH FLOOR IRRIGATION PLAN
**PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>10135 SAN PABLO AVE, EL CERRITO, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>SAN PABLO 888, LLC &amp; HOPWEALTH, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT INFORMATION</td>
<td>JUSSIE KONG, (415) 731-3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT INFORMATION</td>
<td>TOM ZHANG, (510) 759-4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT AREA</td>
<td>21,609 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING</td>
<td>SPAVF3, TURMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>TYPE I A (GROUND FLOOR), TYPE II A (UPPER FLOORS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION</td>
<td>FULLY SPRINKLERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY</td>
<td>MIXED-USE, 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>6 STORIES, 65'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL AREA</td>
<td>56,839 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE AREA</td>
<td>11,063 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT AREA</td>
<td>11,032 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWELLING UNITS</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL UNITS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>TRANSPARENCY (RESIDENTIAL) 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDED</td>
<td>TRANSPARENCY (COMMERCIAL) 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>CAR PARKING: 4 SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDED</td>
<td>PIPE CONTACT: 4 SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>SHORT-TERM BICYCLE PARKING: RETAIL: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDED</td>
<td>LONG-TERM BICYCLE PARKING: RESIDENTIAL: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>COMBINED TOTAL: 7,264 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING INFORMATION**

| REQUIRED | PROVIDED |
| 4 SPACES | 4 SPACES |
| RETAIL | RETAIL |
| 2 | 2 |
| RESIDENTIAL | RESIDENTIAL |
| 7 | 7 |

**TOTAL BUILDING AREA**

| 85,867 SF |

**OPEN SPACE INFORMATION**

| 55,847 SF |
| 2,295 SF |
| 2ND FLOOR: 2,054 SF |
| 3RD FLOOR: 539 SF |
| 4TH FLOOR: 1,051 SF |
| 5TH FLOOR: 1,546 SF |
| 6TH FLOOR: 626 SF |
| TOTAL: 4,044 SF |

**PRIVATE OPEN SPACE**

| 6,873 SF |
| 2,425 SF |
| COMMON OPEN SPACE |
| 7 UNIT X 300 SF UNIT |
| TOTAL: 5,740 SF |
| 3RD FLOOR: 539 SF |
| 4TH FLOOR: 1,051 SF |
| 5TH FLOOR: 1,546 SF |
| 6TH FLOOR: 626 SF |
| TOTAL: 8,044 SF |

**TRANSPARENCY (COMMERCIAL)**

| 75% |

**TRANSPARENCY (RESIDENTIAL)**

| 35.3% |

**PARKING INFORMATION**

| 35.3% |

**RETAIL AREA**

| 4,412 SF |

**RESIDENTIAL AREA**

| 56,839 SF |

**GARAGE AREA**

| 11,063 SF |

**SUPPORT AREA**

| 11,032 SF |

**SHADED PROPERTY**

| 7,264 SF |

**PERSONAL DATA ACCESSORY SPACE**

| 0% |

**SUBJECT PROPERTY**

| 0% |

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

| 0% |

**SHADOW STUDY**

| 0% |

**DAY LIGHT SETBACK 3D DIAGRAM**

| 0% |

**TRANSPARENCY DIAGRAM**

| 0% |

**VICINITY MAP**

| 0% |