
4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/ Aesthetics

4.21.1 Introduction

The design, art and architecture application/aesthetics analysis focuses on the potential for the Master Plan alternatives to adversely affect existing aesthetic quality and views at LAX and in surrounding areas. Technical Report 11, *Design, Art and Architecture Applications/Aesthetics Technical Report*, of the Draft EIS/EIR contains detailed information on existing visual conditions and describes plans and guidelines for evaluating the aesthetic and visual considerations associated with the Master Plan alternatives.

4.21.2 General Approach and Methodology

The analysis of design, art and architecture application/aesthetics presented below is based on the general approach and methodology described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.2), and Technical Report 11, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics Technical Report*, of the Draft EIS/EIR. In addition, the analysis completed for this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR includes consideration of changes to baseline conditions (see Section 4.21.3 below), using the same methodology applied to the 1996 baseline analysis.

4.21.3 Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline

The affected environment/environmental baseline related to design, art and architecture application/aesthetics used in this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR is the same as described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR, with the exceptions identified below that reflect current conditions. The following changes to the affected environment/environmental baseline do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIS/EIR.

- ◆ Recent visual changes on and around the LAX property have resulted from the Gateway LAX project, which included a series of 25- to 60-foot high lighted columns with changing colors near the CTA entrance, in addition to new landscaping and 32-foot high letters noting "LAX" at the intersection of Century and Sepulveda Boulevards and at the I-105 interchange at Sepulveda Boulevard. Extensive landscaping has been introduced within the Century Boulevard median, within which the lit columns extend to the east, as well as along either side of that street, contributing to the Century Corridor's Southern Californian thematic impression.²⁵⁸
- ◆ Several changes and renovations to cargo facilities have recently occurred within the Century Cargo Complex and the South Cargo Complex East, along with appropriate landscape treatments. These buildings generally exhibit modern design elements with a higher degree of architectural interest than many of the older cargo facilities, and as such, they are considered an aesthetic improvement.
- ◆ Since 1997, LAX has undergone a number of minor improvements within the CTA that have been consistent in aesthetic character with existing facilities, have not detracted from the regional airport theme, nor meaningfully altered panoramic views of or across the property.
- ◆ A voluntary residential acquisition/relocation program commenced in 1998 as part of the airport's ongoing Aircraft Noise Mitigation Program (ANMP), resulting in the acquisition of residential properties within the Manchester Square and Belford neighborhoods; several of the acquired residences have been removed to date. As part of the program, all acquired properties are being hydroseeded and secured with green chain-link fencing for security.
- ◆ Within the dunes area at the western end of the site, Sandpiper Street, which offers expansive ocean and airport views, was closed to the public for security purposes following the events of September 11, 2001.

Please refer to Chapter 3, *Alternatives* (subsection 3.2.1), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR, for further discussion of recent airport facility changes.

²⁵⁸ As described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.3), of the Draft EIS/EIR, the rows of palm trees and large-scale modern hotels along Century Boulevard create a "Southern California" thematic impression.

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

4.21.4 Thresholds of Significance

4.21.4.1 CEQA Thresholds of Significance

As stated in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.4.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR, a significant aesthetic or view impact would occur if the direct and indirect changes in the environment that may be caused by the particular build alternative would potentially result in one or more of the following future conditions:

- ◆ Introduction of features that would detract from the existing valued aesthetic quality of a neighborhood, community, or localized area by conflicting/contrasting with important aesthetic elements or the quality of the area (such as a theme, style, setbacks, density, massing, etc.) or cause an inconsistency with applicable design guidelines.
- ◆ Removal of one or more features that contribute to the valued aesthetic character or image of the neighborhood, community, or localized area such as demolition of structures, street trees, a strand of trees, or other landscape features that contribute positively to the valued visual image of a community.
- ◆ Obstruction, interruption, or diminishment of a valued focal or panoramic view or view from any designated scenic highway, corridor, or parkway.

These thresholds of significance are utilized because they address the potential concerns relative to aesthetic resources and views associated with the Master Plan build alternatives. All three thresholds reflect those contained in the *Draft L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* that are relevant to this project.

4.21.4.2 Federal Standards

As stated in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.4.2), of the Draft EIS/EIR, there are no federal standards that define significance thresholds for aesthetic or view impacts.

4.21.5 Master Plan Commitments

The following Master Plan commitment proposed for design, art and architecture application/aesthetics is the same as that presented in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.5), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ DA-1. Provide and Maintain Airport Buffer Areas (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).

Landscaped buffer areas will be provided and maintained along the northerly and southerly boundaries of the airport. These areas will include a greenbelt of trees and landscaping to screen views of airport facilities from adjacent residential uses and other view-sensitive uses as appropriate. Use of existing facilities in buffer areas may continue as required until LAWA can develop alternative facilities.

The following Master Plan commitment has been revised since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR to remove references to the Qualifying [Q] conditions in City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 159,526. These conditions would be incorporated into the LAX Specific Plan/LAX Zone for LAX Northside/Westchester Southside as further described in Master Plan Commitment LU-1, Incorporation of City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 159,526 [Q] Zoning Conditions for LAX Northside into the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside Project (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), in Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.5), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ DA-2. Update and Integrate Design Plans and Guidelines (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).

The following plans and guidelines will be individually updated or integrated into a comprehensive set of design-related guidelines and plans: LAX Street Frontage and Landscape Development Plan (June 1994), LAX Air Cargo Facilities Design Guidelines (April 1998), and LAX Northside Design Plan and Development Guidelines (1989), including conditions addressing heights, setbacks and landscaping. The update will serve as a basis for reviewing future public and private development projects at LAX. The update will incorporate key provisions in current plans with an equivalent or greater level of compatibility and visual quality supported between LAX and adjacent land uses.

The following Master Plan commitment proposed for design, art and architecture application/aesthetics is the same as that presented in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.5), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ **DA-3. Undergrounding of Utility Lines (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

In conjunction with the extension of the Century Freeway and other roadway/right-of-way improvement projects, LAWA will pursue opportunities to place existing overhead utility lines underground wherever feasible and appropriate.

The following Master Plan commitment from another environmental discipline is also relevant to this analysis:

◆ **LI-1. Ring Road Landscaping (Alternative B).**

The above commitment is provided in its entirety in Chapter 5, *Environmental Action Plan*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.21.6 Environmental Consequences

4.21.6.1 No Action/No Project Alternative

The environmental impacts on design, art and architecture application/aesthetics under the No Action/No Project Alternative have not materially changed from those described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.6.1), of the Draft EIS/EIR. However, several of the features identified as part of the No Action/No Project Alternative have been implemented since publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, as indicated previously in Section 4.21.3, *Affected Environment/Environmental Baseline*. Such features include a number of changes and renovations to cargo facilities within the Century Cargo Complex, cargo facility upgrades within the South Cargo Complex East, a landscaped setback along Century Boulevard, the Gateway LAX beautification improvements, taxiway upgrades and improvements, and commencement of acquisition and relocation activities within the Manchester Square and Belford residential areas. The improvements that have been implemented to date have resulted in conditions consistent those anticipated under the No Action/No Project Alternative in the Draft EIS/EIR analysis. Additionally, the acquisition and removal of residences in the Manchester Square and Belford areas is not expected to result in an adverse aesthetic impact.

4.21.6.2 Alternatives A, B, and C

The environmental impacts to design, art and architecture application/aesthetics under Alternatives A, B, and C have not changed from those described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.6), of the Draft EIS/EIR. It should be noted, however, that concerns regarding potential effects on views from Sandpiper Street are no longer an issue since public access to the street segment was discontinued in late 2001 to address security concerns.²⁵⁹

4.21.6.3 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

A complete description of the facilities associated with Alternative D is provided in Chapter 3, *Alternatives* (subsection 3.3.2), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. The features of Alternative D that are relevant to the analysis of aesthetic and view impacts are summarized herein. Alternative D includes the extension, upgrade, and/or relocation of existing runways; new and reconfigured taxiways; new passenger terminal buildings and a new linear concourse that would replace existing Terminals 1 through 3 and existing CTA parking; a new GTC within the Manchester Square area, an ITC, a consolidated RAC facility, and an APM connecting these facilities to the CTA; limited new and redeveloped cargo facilities along Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway; a number of ancillary facilities; and development of LAX Northside. Property acquisition totaling approximately 77 acres would be required under Alternative D, reduced from 273 acres under Alternative A, 345 acres under Alternative B, and 216 acres under Alternative C. In contrast to the respective elements of the other build alternatives, Alternative D would not include the development of the LAX Expressway or the ring road, nor would it involve relocation of the LAX fuel farm.

²⁵⁹ The analysis within the Draft EIS/EIR concluded that views of arriving and departing aircraft from elevated vantage points along Sandpiper Street would not be blocked or substantially diminished by Master Plan improvements.

Century Corridor/Eastern Boundary and Continental City

Under Alternative D, limited new and redeveloped cargo buildings and ancillary facilities would be constructed along the south side of Century Boulevard between Sepulveda and Aviation Boulevards. These facilities would not intensify development along the Century Corridor to the extent expected under Alternative A. Compliance with the LAX Air Cargo Facilities Design Guidelines (Cargo Guidelines) would reduce potential visual effects on pedestrians, motorists, and hotel and commercial uses to the north, similar to the other build alternatives. Similar to the other alternatives, Alternative D would include an approximately 50-foot wide continuous landscaped parkway on the south side of Century Boulevard from just east of Aviation Boulevard to the CTA. As such, the new and replacement facilities are expected to enhance the existing aesthetic quality of the area and the function of Century Boulevard as the "Gateway" to the airport. Furthermore, the infill development is not expected to significantly affect valued focal or panoramic views, which would remain accessible from the upper stories of hotels on Century Boulevard. In contrast to Alternatives A and B, acquisition and redevelopment of property on the north side of Century Boulevard just east of Sepulveda Boulevard would not occur.

Under Alternative D, the Manchester Square area would be developed with the GTC, a group of parallel buildings consisting of two multi-level terminal-like structures, called "piers," adjacent parking facilities ranging from three to five stories, and a commercial vehicle holding area along Arbor Vitae Street. The maximum building heights in this area would be 60 feet. A network of ground-level and elevated access roadways and ramps would be provided throughout the area, along with interstitial pedestrian bridges connecting the piers to the parking structures. Development of the GTC would represent a substantial change from current uses within Manchester Square. However, as this area consists predominantly of an isolated pocket of residences bordered by industrial and commercial uses, the new facilities would be more in character with surrounding development. Efforts to promote the visual compatibility of the GTC with surrounding uses would be undertaken during the architectural design and development phases, in support of LAX Interim Plan objectives. Nonetheless, the new facilities would contrast in size with off-airport land uses to the north, south, and west.

The GTC would be surrounded by landscaped open space that would serve as a buffer for adjacent off-site uses and roadways. Edge and landscape treatments would be provided in compliance with the LAX Street Frontage and Landscape Development Plan (Street Frontage and Landscape Plan). With observance of applicable design guidelines and plan provisions for open space/landscape buffers, aesthetic impacts from this facility are considered less than significant. Furthermore, as the existing visual quality in portions of the Manchester Square area is low, development of the GTC would generally represent an upgraded condition.

With increased building heights relative to existing residential development, the GTC would be clearly visible from adjacent roadways and properties, as well as from distant, elevated viewpoints. However, the majority of surrounding vantages do not support valued focal or panoramic views due to the generally flat topography and commercial/industrial nature of the immediate area. Views of the GTC from the elevated I-405 freeway to the east would occur, though any resulting view obstruction would be fleeting for motorists traveling at high vehicular speeds, and intervening high-rise development immediately adjacent to I-405 north of Century Boulevard would diminish any potential affects on views. Similarly, I-105 to the south does not support valued views that would be appreciably obstructed by the GTC. Furthermore, the new facilities would not be of sufficient height to figure prominently in views from more distant, elevated vantages to the northwest and southwest. Therefore, no significant view impacts are expected.

South of the GTC, elevated access roadways ranging in height of up to 20 feet above grade would parallel the east side of Aviation Boulevard between Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway, with hook and loop ramps connecting to the surrounding streets. Support pilings would be visible along this segment of Aviation Boulevard. Also within this area, a surface parking lot would be developed on La Cienega Boulevard for remote long-term parking. Extensive open space/landscape areas would buffer these improvements and line all street frontages in this area in compliance with the Street Frontage and Landscape Plan. Replacing existing industrial, commercial, and parking uses, the new facilities would not be incompatible with adjacent commercial and industrial uses. Moreover, vantages from the commercial and industrial buildings adjacent to the eastern end of the site do not support valued focal or panoramic views. As such, no significant aesthetic or view impacts are expected in this area.

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

Under Alternative D, the Continental City site would be developed with a multi-level ITC and an associated three-level parking structure. Maximum building heights in this area would be approximately 40 feet. The ITC would include a pedestrian bridge with moving walkways connecting to the Green Line Light Rail Transit station across Imperial Highway to the south. This enclosed pedestrian bridge would cross over Imperial Highway and under I-105, with a minimum clearance of approximately 17 feet and a maximum height of approximately 32 feet. The design of the pedestrian bridge would be integrated with that of the adjacent ITC building and would generally exhibit modern design and architectural elements. These facilities would be sensitively designed for functional and visual compatibility with surrounding uses, and appropriate landscape amenities would be provided around the perimeter of the ITC in accordance with applicable guidelines in order to present a cohesive image for the site.

Development of the ITC would upgrade a currently vacant site that has poor visual quality and no valued aesthetic resources. The proposed facilities represent a substantial reduction in development relative to current entitlements for the property of approximately 3.1 million square feet (MSF) of mixed uses and buildings of up to 17 stories. As the facilities would not contrast with or be out of character with adjacent commercial development and transportation infrastructure, no significant aesthetic impacts are expected.

As with the GTC, views of the ITC would be available from adjacent roadways and properties, the majority of which do not support valued focal or panoramic views. Although views of the ITC would be available from I-405 to the east and I-105 immediately to the south, any resulting view obstruction would be fleeting for motorists traveling at high vehicular speeds and would not affect a considerable portion of the field of view. Furthermore, northerly views of the mountains from I-105 would not be obstructed by the proposed approximately 40-foot high structure since the elevations of I-105 and associated connector ramps in the immediate vicinity of the ITC site range in height from 80 to 167 feet. Additionally, any resulting view obstruction from surrounding roadways would be substantially reduced relative to that expected under the currently entitled Continental City project development due to considerably reduced building heights. Moreover, the new facilities would not be of sufficient height or massing to figure prominently in views from more distant, elevated vantages to the northwest and southwest. Consequently, no significant view impacts are expected.

Throughout the Century Corridor, eastern boundary area, and Continental City property, a state-of-the-art APM and associated infrastructure would be visible. The APM would connect the CTA with the GTC, ITC, and RAC (described below), operating on a fixed dual-lane guideway in a landscaped exclusive right-of-way measuring approximately 50-feet wide. Much of the APM guideway would consist of an elevated concrete structure approximately 24 to 30 feet wide at an elevation of 22 to 24 feet above grade, with the APM cars adding an additional 12 feet of height. The elevated segments of the guideway would have support columns placed approximately 80 to 100 feet on center. The length of the APM trains would vary throughout the day based on demand, though in general the trains would consist of up to six cars, with each car measuring 40 feet or greater in length.

Within the CTA, between the new landside terminal facilities and Sepulveda Boulevard, the APM would run on a subterranean guideway. East of the CTA, a northern east-west APM alignment would transition to above-grade east of Sepulveda Boulevard and would generally follow 98th Street, servicing the RAC then turning south to the ITC, as shown in Figure S3-8, Alternative D - 2015 Enhanced Safety and Security Plan, in Chapter 3, *Alternatives*, of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. South of Century Boulevard, the APM would parallel the GTC access roadways, continuing south to the ITC, the basement level of which would house an APM maintenance service facility. A southern east-west alignment, which would connect the CTA directly to the GTC would extend east from the CTA, cross Sepulveda Boulevard at an elevation (to the top of the guideway) of approximately 30 to 35 feet and would follow Avion Drive or the median between Avion and Century Boulevard. Near the intersection of Century and Aviation Boulevards, this southern alignment would cross over the existing Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) grade-separated right-of-way and split, with one branch reaching a height of 40 feet to the top of the guideway and the split crossing over at a height of 60 feet to the top of the guideway. At each of the APM stations, the guideway lanes would flare around a center platform. The APM alignment is designed to minimize interference with existing facilities and development along Century Boulevard and to preclude conflicts with traffic on surrounding roadways.

The APM would be clearly visible from adjacent roadways and properties, and certain segments, such as the cross-over at Century and Aviation Boulevards, could be visible from high rise buildings in the vicinity as well as more distant, elevated vantages. While development of the APM would introduce a new and

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

unique feature in the project area, it would not require the removal of features that contribute to the valued aesthetic quality of the area, nor would the APM detract from the area's existing aesthetic character. The guideway would have little contrast with adjacent development and infrastructure, including existing warehouse-style cargo facilities, the MTA right-of-way and grade-separated overpass, the proposed GTC elevated access roadways, and surrounding parking facilities and airfield improvements. In several areas, such as along Aviation Boulevard south of Century Boulevard, the poor visual quality evident under existing conditions would be upgraded by the improvements. The APM would be designed to promote the Southern Californian landscape theme evident in the CTA and the Century Corridor, with extensive landscape amenities provided in accordance with the Street Frontage and Landscape Plan. APM landscaping would complement existing visual resources and create a cohesive image throughout the airport property. Along most of its alignment, the height of the APM guideway would be shorter than surrounding mid- and high-rise buildings, and thus would not create a vertical visual discord. Additionally, the spacing of the support columns would reduce the visual bulk or massing of the guideway, thereby retaining the visual openness and boulevard character of the Century Corridor. As such, significant aesthetic impacts would not be expected in conjunction with the APM.

As discussed above, the majority of surrounding vantage points do not support valued focal or panoramic views. Views of the APM from the I-105, as well as from nearby high-rises and distant, elevated vantages would be available intermittently; however, the shorter height of the APM guideway relative to adjacent facilities would limit the potential for view obstruction. The guideway would not be of sufficient height or massing to figure prominently in views from distant locations. Consequently, no significant view impacts are expected.

Compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, Alternative D would involve more extensive visual changes in the Century Corridor and eastern boundary area due to development of Manchester Square and introduction of the APM. These differences would not, however, represent a greater aesthetic or view impact. Improvements south of Century Boulevard would be similar under both alternatives, and Alternative D would substantially lower the density of development within the Continental City property, which could be considered more aesthetically pleasing to some individuals. Alternative D would also result in more extensive facility and landscape upgrades, supporting a more cohesive image for the site.

Central Terminal Area

As part of Alternative D, new passenger terminal buildings would replace the existing parking garages within the CTA, and a new linear concourse would replace existing Terminals 1 through 3 and a portion of the TBIT. Terminals 4 through 7 would be reconfigured as necessary to improve passenger facilities and integrate the concourses with the new passenger buildings. No modifications to the central theme building or air traffic control tower would occur. Since the existing terminal buildings are primarily designed for function and access and generally lack architectural interest or extensive landscaping, they do not contribute meaningfully to the aesthetic quality of the CTA. As such, their removal would not constitute the loss of valued visual resources. The reconfigured Terminals 1 through 4, which would be a maximum of five levels each, would connect via pedestrian bridges to the existing southern concourses and the new north linear concourse, which would comprise a maximum of three levels. These new facilities, while also designed for functionality, would likely incorporate more modern design elements, greater architectural articulation, and more extensive landscape amenities than present under existing conditions, consistent with the CTA's Southern Californian landscape theme. Thus, the new facilities would represent an aesthetic improvement within the CTA and would promote the airport's image as a Gateway to the City of Los Angeles. Significant aesthetic impacts would not occur.

The reconfigured terminal facilities would not affect views from within the CTA, since views of the airfield and adjacent areas are currently blocked by the existing terminals. While the proposed CTA changes would be visible from off-airport areas to the north, the gate positions and associated parked aircraft would continue to be the most visible features from off-site, the visual nature of which would not change substantially. The terminal facility building heights could potentially be approximately 20 to 30 feet taller than the existing structures; however, given the distance to off-site vantages to the north and south, long-range views would not be affected. Significant impacts to views would not result.

Additional CTA improvements proposed as part of Alternative D include a new West Satellite Concourse immediately west of the TBIT, a subterranean APM connecting the West Satellite Concourse to the TBIT, and the demolition of existing Terminal 8. The West Satellite Concourse would measure approximately

1,900 feet long by 120 feet wide and would be consistent in design and function with surrounding terminal facilities. It would replace several existing maintenance hangars and would not be of sufficient height to obstruct long-range views from off-site. The removal of Terminal 8 could potentially open up views from some on- and off-site vantages. Airfield improvements would include the extension, upgrade, and/or relocation of existing runways and new and reconfigured taxiways. Most notably, Runway 6R/24L would be moved approximately 338 feet to the south in order to provide a parallel taxiway between the north airfield runways. The proposed airfield improvements, while expanding the area in which visible aircraft activity occurs, would not contrast with existing airfield aesthetic conditions or cause view obstruction from off-site vantages. Associated changes in airfield lighting are addressed in Section 4.18, *Light Emissions* (subsection 4.18.6.1), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR. Within the CTA, no significant aesthetic and view impacts would occur.

Under Alternative D, visual improvements with more extensive facility and landscape upgrades would occur compared to the No Action/No Project Alternative, supporting a more cohesive image for the area.

Southern Boundary

Limited replacement and upgraded cargo and ancillary facilities would be developed along Imperial Highway along the southern site boundary, representing little change from the No Action/No Project Alternative plans. The vacant Continental City site, currently characterized by poor visual quality, would be developed with the ITC, the impacts of which are discussed above. Given expectations for quality development and landscape amenities prescribed in the Cargo Guidelines, visual upgrades would likely result and significant impacts would not be anticipated. As under the other alternatives, the replacement facilities would represent infill development that would integrate with existing facilities, resulting in a slight intensification of cargo uses in an area with dominant industrial character and no notable aesthetic resources. It is expected that the new facilities would present a higher quality and more cohesive image than under current conditions and would have little contrast with adjacent commercial and industrial uses. Implementation of Master Plan Commitments DA-1, Provide and Maintain Airport Buffer Areas (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and DA-3, Undergrounding of Utility Lines (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), would also ensure visual quality by maintaining appropriate landscape buffers and undergrounding utility lines where feasible. Furthermore, no valued focal or panoramic views would be obstructed from the south, particularly from north-bound Sepulveda Boulevard, due to intervening topography and the I-105 support pilings. With a distance of about 400 feet to the nearest sensitive receptors to the south, view obstruction affecting such uses would also be minimal. As such, no significant aesthetic or view impacts are expected.

In general, the visual changes resulting from Alternative D would be similar to those expected under the No Action/No Project Alternative, though visual improvements with slightly more extensive facility and landscape upgrades would occur under Alternative D, supporting a more cohesive image for the area.

Western Boundary

Development within the western boundary area would also be somewhat limited under Alternative D. Improvements would include a new four-level employee parking garage immediately south of World Way West near Pershing Drive; new airline maintenance and ground run-up enclosure (GRE) facilities, in addition to a relocated fire station; and the removal of two airline maintenance complexes and the existing remote aircraft gates north of World Way West near Pershing Drive. The existing fuel farm would remain in its current location. Development in this area would not be appreciably intensified as a result, nor would the improvements represent a substantial change or contrast with existing facilities. Similar to the other build alternatives, aesthetic and view impacts from vantage points along Pershing Drive and from more distant points north and south of the airport would not be significant since the area does not currently support a high level of visual quality or contain important aesthetic elements.

The north airfield runways and taxiways would also be improved and extended near the western end of the site. These improvements would represent a continuation and upgrade of existing on-site facilities. The improvements would generally occur at grade level and would not block any valued focal or panoramic view. Additionally, with the exception of changes to existing navigational aids, no development would take place in the Habitat Restoration Area, and views of the dunes and views along the Vista del Mar Scenic Highway would not change. As a result, no significant aesthetic or view impacts are expected.

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

Alternative D development of new and upgraded airport facilities in the western boundary area would contrast with the limited changes in this area under the No Action/No Project Alternative. These differences with the No Action/No Project Alternative do not, however, represent a greater aesthetic or view impact.

Northern Boundary

Implementation of Alternative D would include the development of the LAX Northside property, as would occur under the No Action/No Project Alternative. For the purpose of this analysis, the proposed site configuration and building density is assumed to be similar to that contemplated under the original LAX Northside Development Project, and new development would be subject to building height restrictions, setback requirements, and landscape guidelines specified in the LAX Northside Design Plan and Development Guidelines (Design Plan) and the new LAX Specific Plan/LAX Zone, which will incorporate relevant provisions from City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 159,526 and the associated Qualifying [Q] zoning conditions originally established for LAX Northside (refer to Master Plan Commitment LU-1, Incorporation of City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 159,526 [Q] Zoning Conditions for LAX Northside into the LAX Northside/Westchester Southside Project (Alternatives A, B, C, and D), and Section 4.2, *Land Use* (subsection 4.2.6.5), of this Supplement to the Draft EIS/EIR for further discussion). Based on the proposed reduction in the LAX Northside trip cap that would occur under Alternative D, build out of LAX Northside would be less than the 4.5 million square feet of development that is currently entitled (refer to Chapter 4, *Affected Environment, Consequences and Mitigation Measures* (Analytical Framework section)). The Design Plan and design-related elements of the LAX Specific Plan/LAX Zone are intended to create a visually open appearance and promote design sensitivity to the residential interface. As under the No Action/No Project Alternative, implementation of these design provisions would create an aesthetically pleasing interface, and setbacks and height limits would reduce visual intrusion and the obscuring of distant views. Although views from certain high-rise apartment buildings on the west side of Lincoln Boulevard would change, existing views are not considered scenic or of high aesthetic quality. The contrast between the proposed development and existing conditions, while notable, would not represent a significant aesthetic impact. Consequently, no significant aesthetic or view impacts are expected in LAX Northside.

East of Sepulveda Boulevard, new consolidated RAC facilities would replace existing rental car facilities and long-term parking (Lot C). The RAC facilities would consist of a three-level, approximately 40-foot high, 150,000-square-foot customer service building and an adjacent four-level ready/return garage on the north side of 98th Street west of Airport Boulevard, a quick turnaround area (QTA) with cleaning and fueling facilities immediately to the north, and approximately 83 acres of surface parking for vehicular storage and overflow parking. The second level of the customer service building would connect to the APM system via a direct pedestrian bridge. Approximately 15 percent, or about 24 acres, of the RAC site would be dedicated to open space and landscape requirements, with edge treatments provided in accordance with the Street Frontage and Landscape Plan and particular sensitivity to the residential neighborhood to the north. Additionally, the Carl E. Nielsen Youth Park at the north end of the site would remain in place. Since the new facilities would be similar in nature to those now existing, a substantial change in visual character, and thus in views of the site, would not be expected. The new facilities would likely incorporate more modern design elements and architectural interest than the existing structures, and therefore, would represent an aesthetic improvement. While the new RAC facilities would include structures with taller building heights than currently exist in this area, scenic views from surrounding vantages would not be affected, as valued focal or panoramic views are limited by the generally flat topography. Furthermore, the facilities would not significantly alter existing views of rental car facilities and surface parking afforded from the upper stories of hotels on Century Boulevard. Significant aesthetic and view impacts would not be expected.

The visual changes expected at LAX Northside under Alternative D would be similar to, or less than, those of the No Action/No Project Alternative, depending on the ultimate nature and extent of build out development that would occur under the reduced trip cap. Greater visual changes would occur east of Sepulveda Boulevard due to development of the RAC facilities, however, these differences do not represent a greater aesthetic or view impact.

Construction

Extensive and widespread construction during the demolition and construction of structures and roadways would create a strong visual contrast in and around the airport. Major areas of construction activity would be focused within the CTA; at the eastern end of the airport along Aviation Boulevard, within the Manchester Square area, and at the Continental City project site; along the northern boundary of the airport at LAX Northside; and east of Sepulveda Boulevard along 98th Street. Construction would be evident along the Century Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard approaches to the airport. Construction activities would also be visible along the southern boundary of the airport, near the Sepulveda Boulevard/Imperial Highway intersection and areas extending east to the I-405.

Areas most exposed and sensitive to views of the construction activities would include: residential areas adjacent to LAX Northside; residential neighborhoods along the northern boundary east of Sepulveda Boulevard; residential and hotel uses along the southern site boundary along Imperial Highway west of Sepulveda Boulevard; and areas along Sepulveda and Century Boulevards, two key approaches to the airport. Although construction would be phased from the time of approval of the LAX Master Plan through 2015, these construction activities would cause areas of the airport environs to have an incomplete, disrupted, and unattractive quality. The short-term aesthetic effects of construction on surrounding uses and airport visitors are considered to be significant. In comparison, the short-term aesthetic effects of construction under the No Action/No Project Alternative would not be as extensive.

4.21.7 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts to design, art and architecture application/aesthetics associated with the No Action/No Project Alternative and Alternatives A, B, or C, in combination with other past, present, and probable future projects, have not changed from those described in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.7), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

4.21.7.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

The overall changes in visual conditions under Alternative D would be positive, and only limited aesthetic and view impacts would occur in conjunction with construction activities. A more unified and cohesive image throughout the airport property would result from the proposed improvements, enhancing the built environment at LAX and maintaining long-range scenic views of and across the site. While the currently vacant LAX Northside site would be developed, the uses proposed adjacent to existing neighborhoods would, through design and compliance with project conditions, be of a compatible scale and setback and buffered to prevent significant aesthetic impacts. However, construction activities would cause the site to have a temporarily incomplete, disrupted, and unattractive quality. With implementation of the Master Plan commitments and mitigation measures, in addition to adherence to applicable regulations, development standards, and guidelines, impacts on views and aesthetics associated with Alternative D would be less than significant.

For other independent development projects in the area, the mitigation set forth in environmental documents and project compliance with adopted plans and regulations would support reasonable standards for urban development. The cumulative loss of vacant land associated with Alternative D and the Playa Vista project may or may not represent a negative visual impact, depending on the subjective perception of the viewer. This is due to the highly disturbed nature of much of this area, the provision of landscaped amenities with new development, and the enhancement of large areas of degraded wetlands. Considering that Alternative D would have an overall beneficial effect on visual quality, the contribution of Alternative D to significant cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Temporary construction activities associated with Alternative D and other future concurrent projects would, however, create visual discord and result in a temporary significant cumulative impact.

4.21.8 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are the same as those identified in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.8), of the Draft EIS/EIR.

◆ **MM-DA-1. Construction Fencing (Alternatives A, B, C, and D).**

Construction fencing and pedestrian canopies shall be installed by LAWA to the degree feasible to ensure maximum screening of areas under construction along major public approach and perimeter

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

roadways, including Sepulveda Boulevard, Century Boulevard, Westchester Parkway, Pershing Drive, and Imperial Highway west of Sepulveda Boulevard. Along Century Boulevard, Sepulveda Boulevard, and in other areas where the quality of public views are a high priority, provisions shall be made by LAWA for temporary art, murals, or other treatment of the fencing to reduce temporary visual impacts.

◆ **MM-DA-2. LAX Expressway View Analysis (Alternatives A, B, and C).**

As part of final design for the LAX Expressway, a view analysis shall be undertaken by LAWA to address aesthetic impacts on residential and other view sensitive properties. The view analysis shall document proposed roadway elevations, setbacks, and landscaped buffer areas, determining the extent to which existing views from residential and other view sensitive properties would be degraded. As a performance standard, project design features or conditions of approval shall ensure that the LAX Expressway is attractively screened from the view of significantly impacted properties to an equivalent or greater level than provided by existing landscaping or other intervening structures that screen views to the I-405. Screening shall be achieved through measures that may include, but shall not be limited to, decorative block walls and landscaped greenbelts.

◆ **MM-DA-3(a). Scattergood Visual Effects (Alternative B).**

Prior to approval of fuel farm plans for the Scattergood site and based on more detailed development and grading plans, LAWA shall complete a visual survey to determine the following:

- ◆ Existing views of the ocean and of the tank site from residences on Loma Vista Avenue.
- ◆ The effects of the planned development on existing views from residences on Loma Vista including staking of maximum tank heights.
- ◆ The line-of-sight and exposed tank surface area (including the 50-foot fire water tank) of the existing and proposed facility, from east- and west-bound Grand Avenue, south-bound Vista del Mar, west-bound Franklin Avenue (City of El Segundo), Dockweiler State Beach, and the South Bay Bicycle Trail located west of Vista del Mar.
- ◆ The changes to the site topography and tank exposure affected by the removal of the existing berm.

◆ **MM-DA-3(b). Scattergood Visual Effects (Alternative B).**

The visual survey shall specify measures to be implemented by LAWA which shall maintain or enhance the visual quality of the site and reduce to a less-than significant level visual impacts on views from Vista del Mar, Dockweiler State Beach, the regional bike path, Franklin Street, Grand Avenue, and affected residential uses on Loma Vista. Performance standards include:

- ◆ Avoiding view blockage from primary windows and viewing areas of adjacent homes; or, if not feasible, achieving a less than 10 percent diminishment of existing ocean views.
- ◆ Ensuring no net increase in surface tank exposure to views from Vista del Mar, Dockweiler State Beach, the regional bike path, Franklin Street, and Grand Avenue.
- ◆ Achieving an equivalent or greater level of aesthetic quality than currently exists on the site as viewed from public vantage points.

To achieve these performance standards, LAWA actions shall include but not necessarily be limited to the following:

- ◆ Placement of the proposed facilities to prevent incursion into existing ocean views.
- ◆ The use of contour grading to enhance the dune natural appearance of the site.
- ◆ Development of site topography to reduce the visual exposure of the fuel tanks and facilities from key vantage points.
- ◆ Reduction in the proposed height of individual fuel tanks to reduce visual exposure from key vantage points and avoid screening of existing ocean views.
- ◆ Provision of setbacks from Grand Avenue and from the northern property line equivalent to, or greater than, what exists.

- ♦ Installation of dense landscaped buffers along Grand Avenue and in other areas of the site to screen the industrial facilities from key vantage points along Vista del Mar and to the west.
- ♦ Development of walls or berms combined with landscaping for screening.
- ♦ Subtle coloring of the tanks and on-site structures consistent with earth tones.
- ♦ Verification of achievement of the performance standards prior to initiation of facility operations.

4.21.9 Level of Significance After Mitigation

As stated in Section 4.21, *Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics* (subsection 4.21.9), of the Draft EIS/EIR, visual and aesthetic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

4.21.9.1 Alternative D - Enhanced Safety and Security Plan

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, the aesthetic and view impacts associated with Alternative D would be reduced to less than significant levels.

4.21 Design, Art and Architecture Application/Aesthetics

This Page Intentionally Left Blank