

6 Alternatives

As required by Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would attain most of its basic objectives (stated in Section 2.5 of this EIR) but would avoid or substantially lessen any of its significant effects.

The key objectives of the project are to:

- Provide construction of high quality housing consistent with the City of Long Beach 2013-2021 Housing Element
- Create an attractive, high quality neighborhood design that reflects the project site’s unique location
- Provide residential development that does not conflict with surrounding land uses and neighborhoods
- Provide a walkable pedestrian friendly neighborhood with recreational amenities
- Create a financially viable project that provides for the creation of construction employment opportunities, recreational opportunities, and expanded housing opportunities; and
- Enhance the City’s ability to provide services through fiscally-positive development.

Included in this analysis are four alternatives, including the CEQA-required “no project” alternative, that involve changes to the project to help reduce its environmental impacts as identified in this EIR. This section also identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Private Elementary School
- Alternative 3: Event Venue

Table 8 provides a summary comparison of the development characteristics of the proposed project and each of the alternatives considered. A more detailed description of the alternatives is included in the impact analysis for each alternative.

Table 8 Project Alternative Comparison

Feature	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Private Elementary School	Alternative 3: Event Venue
Residential Lots	40	0	0	0
Demolition Required	Yes – all existing structures	No	Yes – church would remain, other structures would be demolished	No

All of these alternatives are described and analyzed below. Following the analysis of these three alternatives is a discussion of alternatives that were considered for analysis, but rejected as infeasible. In addition, this section includes a discussion of the “environmentally superior alternative” among the alternatives studied.

6.1 No Project Alternative

This alternative assumes that the proposed project is not constructed on the site. The site would continue in its current condition and that the existing church, daycare, and associated parking lots would remain and continue to operate. Under this alternative the church would not be demolished and therefore the significant and unavoidable cultural resource impact associated with the proposed project would not occur. However, traffic would not be reduced as it would under the proposed project. No environmental impacts would occur and none of the mitigation measures for the proposed project would apply. This alternative would not meet any of the project objectives.

6.2 Private Elementary School Alternative

6.2.1 Description

The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing church and the construction of 40 single family residences and associated infrastructure. Under this alternative, the church and daycare would no longer operate on the site. Instead, the site would be occupied by a private elementary school that would use the existing chapel. The other buildings would be demolished and replaced with new classroom buildings that would be built on the western portion of the site. It is assumed that one acre of the site would be developed with new classroom buildings. The size of the site and the location of the chapel in the middle of the parcel would limit the classroom space that could be constructed and thus limit the number of students that would attend the school under this alternative. The new classroom buildings plus the existing chapel would total 62,000 sf and approximately 3,000 students. The parking lot would remain and the lawn would be used for recreation. This alternative would not meet most of the project objectives.

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Cultural Resources

As with the proposed project, the buildings other than the chapel would be demolished under this alternative. However, the chapel would not be demolished. Since the chapel is the only building with historical significance, the significant and unavoidable cultural resource impact associated with the proposed project would be avoided. Since the chapel would be repurposed for use by the school, additional mitigation would be required to ensure that aspects of the chapel that are historically significant, such as the glass portion of the eastern façade, are not altered or and that any renovations are consistent with Secretary of the Interior standards.

b. Transportation and Traffic

As shown in Table 9, Alternative 2 would generate more trips than the proposed project and would result in a net increase in overall daily and AM peak hour traffic to and from the site as compared to existing conditions. PM peak hour traffic would be lower than existing conditions, but greater than what would occur under the proposed project. The increase in AM peak hour traffic (net increase of 190 trips) could potentially result in significant impacts at nearby intersections, notably North Norwalk Boulevard and 226th Street.

Table 9 Alternative 2 Trip Generation Analysis

	ADT	AM	PM
Alternative 1 – Private Elementary School ¹	957	322	75
Existing	902	132	133
Net – Alternative 1	57	190	(58)
Net – Proposed Project	(521)	(101)	(93)

() denoted negative number

¹ITE Trip Generation Manual – 8th Edition Land Use 520 – Elementary School

6.3 Event Venue Alternative

6.3.1 Description

This alternative considers the use of the site as a special event venue. No buildings would be demolished. The site and buildings would be used for events such as parties or weddings. Alterations would be required most likely including removal of the pews in the chapel and retrofitting the accessory buildings for catering. The chapel for banquet style seating would hold approximately 2,000 people. This alternative would not meet most of the project objectives.

6.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Cultural Resources

None of the existing structures would be demolished under this alternative. Therefore, the significant and unavoidable cultural resource impact associated with the proposed project would be avoided. Because the chapel would be repurposed for use as an event venue and would be altered/repurposed, mitigation would be required to ensure that aspects of the chapel that are historically significant, such as the glass portion of the eastern façade, are not altered, and to ensure that any alterations are consistent with Secretary of the Interior standards.

b. Transportation and Traffic

An event venue would generate trips sporadically and during off hours with most trips happening in the evenings and on weekends. Under this alternative, AM peak hour trips would likely be reduced. Using a trip rate of 1.5 people per car, approximately 1,300 trips would occur if the venue was full. These trips would occur in the evening hours and on the weekends. This would increase trips in the evenings and weekends over the proposed project, see Table 5. Impacts would be greater than that of the proposed project.

6.4 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

During the preparation of this EIR, consideration was given to three additional alternatives, but these were ultimately rejected. The three alternatives that were considered but rejected are a Residential Conversion Alternative, Moving of the Church Alternative, and Reduced Size Alternative. A Residential Conversion Alternative would have converted the chapel and the site into a multifamily residential development. Due to the specific nature of the chapel it was determined that it would not be possible to convert the chapel into a residential use without significant alterations to the structure. A Moving the Church Alternative would require moving the structure of the chapel to a different location. Based on the size of the building, this does not appear to be technically feasible. A Reduced Size Alternative would

reduce the number of residences proposed on the site, but would still involve demolition of the chapel so would not reduce or eliminate the proposed project's significant and unavoidable cultural resource impact.

6.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmental analysis contained in this EIR determined that the proposed project would result in one significant and unavoidable impact and several potentially significant but mitigable environmental impacts. Each of the alternatives considered would avoid the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impact, as discussed below.

All three of the alternatives would eliminate the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact since they would not require the demolition of the chapel. The No Project Alternative is considered environmentally superior. However, this alternative would not meet any of the project objectives (stated in Section 2.0, Project Description) because it would not carry out the proposed project.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The Private Elementary School Alternative would reduce impacts to cultural resources and would be superior to the event venue alternative since it would have a reduced traffic impact. However, this alternative also does not meet most of the objectives of the proposed project.