CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS  
3191 Katella Avenue  
Los Alamitos, CA 90720  

AGENDA  
PLANNING COMMISSION/SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, April 24, 2019 – 7:00 PM

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC  
This Agenda contains a brief general description of each item to be considered. Except as provided by law, action or discussion shall not be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda. Supporting documents, including staff reports, are available for review at City Hall in the Development Services Department or on the City’s website at www.cityoflosalamitos.org once the agenda has been publicly posted.

Any written materials relating to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Development Services Department, 3191 Katella Ave., Los Alamitos CA 90720, during normal business hours. In addition, such writings or documents will be made available for public review at the respective public meeting.

It is the intention of the City of Los Alamitos to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee, or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, please contact the Development Services Department at (562) 431-3538, extension 303, 48 hours prior to the meeting so that reasonable arrangements may be made. Assisted listening devices may be obtained from the Planning Secretary at the meeting for individuals with hearing impairments.

Persons wishing to address the Planning Commission on any item on the Planning Commission Agenda shall sign in on the Oral Communications Sign In sheet which is located on the podium once the item is called by the Chairperson. At this point, you may address the Planning Commission for up to FIVE MINUTES on that particular item.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL  
Chair Riley  
Vice Chair Sofelkanik  
Commissioner Andrade  
Commissioner Cuitty  
Commissioner DeBolt  
Commissioner Grose  
Commissioner Loe

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
   At this time, any individual in the audience may address the Planning Commission and speak on any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. If you wish to speak on an item listed on the agenda, please sign in on the Oral Communications Sign In sheet located on the podium. **Remarks are to be limited to not more than five minutes.**

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular and Special Meetings of March 27, 2019.

6. **DISCUSSION**
   None.

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
   None.

8. **STAFF REPORT**
   None.

9. **PUBLIC HEARING**
   A. Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-03
   Hospital Central Plant at 3832 Catalina Street
   Consideration of a Site Plan Review for a new two-story Central Plant Building (to include a 56 feet tall Thermal Energy Storage (TES) water tank) at 3832 Catalina Street in the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan area at the southeast corner of the intersection of Kaylor Street and Catalina Street (APN 242-162-14). The project would include the demolition of a medical office building at 3791 Katella Avenue (APN 242-163-12), and the construction of a utility bridge across Kaylor Street (APN 242-162-13).

   **Recommendation:**
   1. Open the Public Hearing; and,
   2. Take testimony; and,
   3. Continue the item to the May 22, 2019 Planning Commission meeting so that the Applicant may continue to explore options for screening or otherwise minimizing the aesthetic impact from the proposed TES water tank.

10. **ITEMS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR**

11. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

12. **ADJOURNMENT**
APPEAL PROCEDURES

Any final determination by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council, and must be done so in writing at the Development Services Department, within twenty (20) days after the Planning Commission decision. The appeal must include a statement specifically identifying the portion(s) of the decision with which the appellant disagrees and the basis in each case for the disagreement, accompanied by an appeal fee of $1,000.00 (resident)/$2,349.00 (non-resident) in accordance with Los Alamitos Municipal Code Section 17.68 and Fee Resolution No. 2017-13.

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing Agenda was posted at the following locations: Los Alamitos City Hall, 3191 Katella Avenue; Los Alamitos Community Center, 10911 Oak Street; and, Los Alamitos Museum, 11062 Los Alamitos Boulevard; not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Maria Veronica Encio
Department Secretary

4/17/2019

Date
1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The Planning Commission/Subdivision Committee met in Special Session at 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 27, 2019, in the Council Chamber, 3191 Katella Avenue, Chair DeBolt presiding.

2. **ROLL CALL**
**Present:** Commissioners: Vice Chair Sofelkanik
Andrade, DeBolt, Grose and Loe

Absent: Chair Riley
Commissioner Loe

**Staff:** Les Johnson, Development Services Director
Maria Veronica Enciso, Department Secretary
Michael Daudt, City Attorney
Michelle Müller, Management Analyst
Tom Oliver, Associate Planner
Laura Stetson, MIG
Jose Rodriguez, MIG

3. **DISCUSSION**
**A. Study Session for the Zoning Code Update**
Vice Chair Sofelkanik opened the public hearing.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik closed the public hearing.

Development Services Director Johnson thanked the Planning Commission for their on-going efforts with the discussions pertaining to the Zoning Code Update.

City Attorney Daudt discussed government code section SB1333, which imposes consistency upon Charter Cities, with regards to Land Use provisions in the Zoning Code and Land Use designations and density standards in the general plan.

Commissioner DeBolt discussed the inconsistency addressing acreage between the 25 acres versus a maximum of 30 acres, and the possibility of preserving the maximum to 25 units per acre, which would necessitate an amendment to the general plan. Furthermore, increase to 30 units per acre for purposes of low-income housing.
Laura Stetson with MIG described the existing Density Bonus law, which identifies the ability for a development to approach the City for a density bonus for a low-income housing development, which can increase the acreage to over 30 units per acre.

City Attorney Daudt stated that the density bonus awarded is identified by a mathematical formula based on what is provided to an income group; therefore, it is viewed on a case by case basis. At the time of review, the concessions required to allow the development to go through are identified.

Development Services Director Johnson stated that any proposals for general plan amendments should be recommended to the City Council for their discussion. In addition, should any changes be made, the general plan and housing element would both have to be updated; the housing element will have to meet all current state law provisions.

Development Services Director Johnson advised that review of the rest of the code will continue as scheduled, with a note regarding concern over the R-3 density so that it may be discussed in a more formal position, where a voted recommendation can be presented to the City Council.

The Planning Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Article 3: Zones, Allowable Uses and Development Regulations
  - Height measurement
  - Landscaping
  - Parking and loading
  - Signs

Ms. Stetson summarized the items of discussion.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik questioned what the appropriate starting point for determining the grade of a property would be. Ms. Stetson advised that the grade will be based on the information indicated on the plans.

Development Services Director Johnson discussed the differences between measuring grade from the property elevation or the curb.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from Development Services Director Johnson and Ms. Stetson stating that the grade would be determined at the time of the application.

Commissioner DeBolt discussed the advantages of taking the grade measurement from the curb, as it is mostly common throughout the City.
The Planning Commission and staff discussed possible options for determining the appropriate starting point to determine the grade of a property.

The Planning Commission and staff voted to continue measuring the grade from the front curb while also accounting for the average curb height.

Commissioner DeBolt asked and received clarification from Ms. Stetson stating that going through the proposed changes can be reviewed at the Commission’s pleasure.

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the following:

**Landscaping**

- References Chapter 13.05 (Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance) to avoid duplication
- Clarifies that parking lot landscaping counts toward 15% coverage requirement

Commissioner DeBolt asked and received clarification from Ms. Stetson as to what the state dictates per the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance. Ms. Stetson stated that an existing landscaped area that is less than 5,000 square feet is not required to comply, unless it is a new development.

Commissioner DeBolt suggested a change to identify the requirement for green space that is four feet wide on both sides of the property.

Ms. Stetson asked and received clarification from Associate Planner Oliver stating that this ordinance is not enforced retroactively.

Commissioner DeBolt stated that perhaps there should be provisions for artificial turfs in lieu of grass. Associate Planner Oliver advised that there is already wording in the code for turf, however it can be revised to specify artificial turf.

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the following:

**Parking - Generally**

- Nonresidential standards largely unchanged
- Residential standards adjusted
- Outdoor dining adjusted
- Removed detailed parking lot design standards
Development Services Director Johnson advised that a subsequent meeting will be ideal to continue discussion of the Zoning Code Update. The Planning Commission expressed availability to meet on Tuesday, April 16th at 6 pm.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**  
The Planning Commission adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

---

ATTEST: Victor Sofelkanik, Vice Chair

Les Johnson, Secretary
1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The Planning Commission/Subdivision Committee met in Regular Session at 7:05 p.m., Wednesday, March 27, 2019, in the Council Chamber, 3191 Katella Avenue, Vice Chair Sofelkanik presiding.

2. **ROLL CALL**
   **Present:** Commissioners: Vice Chair Sofelkanik
   Andrade, Cuilty, DeBolt and Grose

   Absent: Chair Riley
   Commissioner Loe

   Staff: Les Johnson, Development Services Director
   Maria Enciso, Department Secretary
   Michael Daudt, City Attorney
   Michelle Müller, Management Analyst
   Tom Oliver, Associate Planner

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Vice Chair Sofelkanik.

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATION**
   Vice Chair Sofelkanik opened the meeting for Oral Communication for items not on the agenda.

   There being no speakers, Vice Chair Sofelkanik closed the public hearing.

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   **A. Approve the Minutes for the Regular and Special Meeting of February 27, 2019.**
   Motion/Second: Grose/DeBolt
   Carried 5/0 (Loe and Riley absent, Cuilty abstained): The Traffic Commission approved the minutes of the Regular and Special meeting of February 27, 2019.

6. **DISCUSSION**
   None.

7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

8. **STAFF REPORT**
Vice Chair Sofelkanik pulled agenda item 9A forward.

9A. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 08-12M2  
Modification of an existing Conditional Use Permit to add 1,260 square feet to a 2,455 square feet “Personal Training and Physical Fitness Use” at 10680 Los Alamitos Boulevard from a second suite (10682 Los Alamitos Boulevard) in the General Commercial (C-G) Zone, APN 242-245-01 (Applicant: Seth Eaker).

Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 1200 square feet expansion of the Los Al Gym located in the Center Plaza shopping center.

Speaker Barbara Bharti-Lands and owner of Beach Fitness in Seal Beach, expressed support for the expansion of the gym.

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the staff report.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik opened the public hearing.

Applicant Seth Eaker described the proposed expansion to the location and the available parking on-site. Mr. Eaker also thanked Associate Planner Oliver and City staff for their efforts.

Commissioner DeBolt asked and received clarification from Mr. Eaker as to whether the basic operation of the gym has remained the same. Mr. Eaker stated that it has remained the same, where they only have Crossfit components but have shifted more towards one on one training; whereas, the expansion is conditioned to be only one on one training.

Speaker Bryce Turner and co-owner of Beach Fitness in Seal Beach, expressed support for the expansion of the gym.

Speaker Tina Herron expressed support for the expansion of the gym and stated that she has never had any problems with parking.

Mark Santos thanked the Planning Commission for their time and consideration. Furthermore, Mr. Santos thanked Associate Planner Oliver for his efforts.

There being no further speakers, Vice Chair Sofelkanik closed the public hearing.

Motion/Second: Cuilty/Andrade  
Carried 5/0 (Loe and Riley absent): Adopt Resolution No. 19-05, entitled, “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, MODIFYING AN EXISTING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 08-12M2) TO ADD 1,260 SQUARE FEET TO A 2,455 SQUARE
FEET “PERSONAL TRAINING AND PHYSICAL FITNESS USE” AT 10680 LOS ALAMITOS BLVD. FROM A SECOND SUITE (10682 LOS ALAMITOS BLVD.) IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (C-G) ZONE, APN 242-245-01 (APPLICANT: SETH EAKER).”

A. Planned Sign Program (PSP) 19-01
Signage for Southland Credit Union – 10701 Los Alamitos Boulevard
Consideration of Planned Sign Program for Southland Credit Union in accordance with the Los Alamitos Municipal Code (LAMC 17.28.060).

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the staff report.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from City Attorney Daudt as to there being no need to recuse himself from the discussion for being a member of the Credit Union. City Attorney Daudt stated that membership with the credit union would not constitute a disqualifying conflict of interest in this case.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik opened the public hearing.

Applicant Tish Scialampo described the proposed signage changes.

There being no further speakers, Vice Chair Sofelkanik closed the public hearing.

Motion/Second: Andrade/Grose
Carried 5/0 (Loe and Riley absent): Adopt Resolution No. 19-07, “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING PLANNED SIGN PROGRAM (PSP) 19-01, as CONDITIONED, CONSISTING OF one (1) pole and three (3) WALL SIGNS LOCATED AT 10701 Los Alamitos Blvd. IN THE General COMMERCIAL (C-G) ZONING DISTRICT, AND DIRECTING A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION BE FILED FOR A CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION FROM CEQA. APN 242-233-34, (APPLICANT: Tish Scialampo, of Absolute Sign, Inc., on behalf of Southland Credit Union).”

9. PUBLIC HEARING
B. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 19-01
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 19-01 - Expand Operational Hours to Remain Open Until 2:00 a.m. in the General Commercial (C-G) Zone 11272 Los Alamitos Boulevard (Griffins Grill).
Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to extend operational hours to remain open until 2:00 a.m. at Griffins Grill Restaurant at 11272 Los Alamitos Boulevard, APN 222-081-04 (Applicant: Mike Gadd, Griffins Grill).

Associate Planner Oliver summarized the staff report.
Vice Chair Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from Associate Planner Oliver that the noise violations can be addressed separately.

Commissioner Andrade inquired about the change in the conditions on the staff report, in comparison to what the applicant requested. Associate Planner Oliver advised that the applicant will be bringing that item forward for discussion during the meeting.

Commissioner Grose asked and received clarification from Associate Planner Oliver as to the bar hours for the Fish Company. Associate Planner Oliver advised that the bar is open 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik opened the public hearing.

Applicants Michael Gadd and Pat Stafford came forward to discuss the reasoning behind needing extended hours of operation every day of the week to 2 a.m., as opposed to it being limited to only late closures on the weekends.

Commissioner Andrade asked and received clarification from Mr. Gadd as to whether this is being sought, for a salability standpoint. Mr. Gadd advised that this approval does play into the ability to sale the business as it has been put up for sale.

Mr. Stafford described the absences of the noise nuisance towards the rear of the property, abutting to the residences.

Speaker Michael Bullock, owner of 11291 Davenport Road described the nuisance imposed as a result of the noise from the restaurant. Mr. Bullock stated concern over the intensity of the base.

Mr. Bullock asked for clarification on the appropriate Police Department to contact at night when the noise get too loud. Vice Chair Sofelkanik advised that he should discuss the jurisdictional matter with City staff.

Mr. Stafford stated that with the exception of one night a month, acoustic music is regularly played on Friday nights.

Resident Cindy, owner of 11291 Pine Street indicated that the noise nuisances are not frequent with Griffith Grill however, she is more concerned over allowing late hour closure.

There being no additional speakers, Vice Chair Sofelkanik closed the public hearing.
City Attorney Daudt stated that this project as well with any other development in the City is subject to the City’s noise standards. Furthermore, all exterior noise is measured at the receiving end whether it is within or outside the City. Therefore, a call to City staff and City police would be appropriate if there is any noise in excess of the noise standards.

Commissioner DeBolt expressed concern over the unknown of whom will buy the business.

Commissioner Grose expressed concern over approving a CUP with an unknown factor and the concern over the new owner not being respectful to citizens like Griffins Grill has been.

Commissioner Cuilty asked and received clarification from City Attorney Daudt as to what could be done if it is approved, the business is sold and the City starts getting complaints about the business. City Attorney Daudt stated that staff is already recommending in the conditions of approval that if such nuisance conditions were to arise, the proposed condition would allow the Director to pull the permit back for revocation consideration or impose new or added conditions to address operational concerns at that time.

Commissioner Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from City Attorney Daudt regarding the added language and whether there is firm legal footing to do that. City Attorney Daudt stated that this provides the opportunity for the CUP to come back to the Planning Commission to evaluate whether the continued use of the CUP is warranted. Furthermore, City Attorney Daudt stated that there is a basis intended as a protective measure, if in an application you later find out that this use is causing problems in the community, the issues can be addressed rather than just being stuck by a prior approval, when the commission did not know what that use would look like on the ground.

Commissioner Andrade asked and received clarification from Associate Planner Oliver as to the existing noise ordinance, which changes the allowable noise after 10 p.m.

Commissioner Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from City Attorney Daudt as to how a possible revocation could be triggered. City Attorney Daudt stated that it can be done the event that the city receives noise or other public disturbances complaints in connection with the use authorized by the CUP.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik asked and received clarification from City Attorney Daudt about how this condition could be applied. City Attorney Daudt stated that the condition would be applied to the use and not the particular tenant or owner which is operating. The focus would be kept on the conduct without tying any of the
approvals to an owner. Therefore, any potential buyer would become aware of the language that the City can pull the permit back.

Commissioner Grose expressed concern over the possibility of a lawsuit without specific language to address the type of complaints, which might warrant revocation. City Attorney Daudt stated that this condition would serve as a protective measure to the City, while leaving some discretion with planning staff to determine what is significant and what to bring back.

City Attorney Daudt stated that the commission would have the ability to retain discretion over the CUP and request an update of the facts and what is happening at that business; this is intended to determine whether there is an issue, which needs to be addressed, rather than being to be in a position where if it is approved as is tonight, there really is no mechanism to pull back if there are problems. City Attorney Daudt stated that this added condition would allow opportunity to retain some jurisdiction and control over that.

Commissioner Andrade asked and received clarification from Associate Planner Oliver as to whether there is a requirement for the back door to remain closed. Associate Planner Oliver stated that the prior approved resolution states that the back door needs to remain closed at all times.

City Attorney Daudt stated that the Planning Commission could require that the CUP come back before the commission on a periodic basis however, the proposed condition would help avoid that administrative burden if there are no problems occurring. However, if the commission would prefer otherwise, it can be requested for the applicant to come back to the commission during a said time period.

Vice Chair Sofelkanik re-opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gadd stated that he has never received complaints from the community. Furthermore, Mr. Gadd added that imposing too many restrictions will put a hardship on them.

Commissioner Andrade asked and received clarification from Mr. Gadd as to whether the back door is kept locked. Mr. Gadd stated that the back door is not locked; smokers do go out to the back of the business and smoke and it is a fire exit.

Commissioner Cuilty inquired as to whether complaints are ever received about the bar Boon Docks. Associate Planner Oliver advised that he does not. Commissioner DeBolt advised that he has seen activity early in the mornings at Boon Docks.

Motion/Second: Cuilty/Grose
Carried 6/0 (Loe and Riley absent): Adopt Resolution No. 19-06, entitled, “A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP 19-01) TO EXTEND APPROVED OPERATIONAL HOURS TO THE HOURS BETWEEN 6:00 A.M. UNTIL 2:00 A.M., AT 11272 LOS ALAMITOS BOULEVARD IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (C-G) ZONE, AND DIRECTING A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION BE FILED FOR A CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION FROM CEQA, APN 222-081-04 (APPLICANT: MIKE GADD, GRIFFINS GRILL)” with the added condition to operation hours to allow a closing time of 2 a.m Fridays and Saturdays; closing time of midnight Sunday through Thursday; and if any complaints are received, have it be brought back before the Planning Commission for re-consideration.

10. ITEMS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR
Development Service Director advised the Commission of the following:
- Introduced the new Department Secretary Maria Enciso
- Announcement of Epson North America moving into 3131 Katella Avenue
- Final floor frame of the hotel is nearing. A more realistic finish date will likely be Spring of next year.
- Starbucks at 5252 Katella Avenue is framed up however, no second tenant has been secured.

Commissioner Grose complimented the progress that CVS is making with their clean-up, and also advised that the post office has overgrown vegetation.

11. COMMISSIONER REPORTS
None.

12. ADJOURNMENT
The Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

ATTEST: Victor Sofelkanik, Vice Chair

Les Johnson, Secretary
City of Los Alamitos
PLANNING COMMISSION/SUBDIVISION
COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: April 24, 2019
ITEM NUMBER: 9A

To: Chair Riley and Members of the Planning Commission
Via: Les Johnson, Development Services Director
From: Tom Oliver, Associate Planner
Subject: Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-03
Hospital Central Plant
3832 Catalina Street

SUMMARY: Consideration of a Site Plan Review (SPR 18-03) for a new two-story Central Plant Building (to include a 56 foot tall Thermal Energy Storage (TES) water tank) at 3832 Catalina Street in the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan area at the southeast corner of the intersection of Kaylor Street and Catalina Street (APN 242-162-14). The project would include the demolition of a medical office building at 3791 Katella Avenue (APN 242-163-12), and the construction of a utility bridge across Kaylor Street (APN 242-162-13).

RECOMMENDATION:
1. Open the Public Hearing; and,
2. Take testimony; and,
3. Continue the item to the May 22, 2019 Planning Commission meeting so that the Applicant may continue to explore options for screening or otherwise minimizing the aesthetic impact from the proposed TES water tank.

APPLICANT: Kent Clayton, represented by AJ Omar – Tenet Health

LOCATION: 3832 & 3791 Katella Avenue (APNs 242-162-14, 242-163-12, & 242-162-13)

ENVIRONMENTAL: The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, and local guidelines. In accordance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act,
Environmental Impact Report SCH #2010041095 was certified by the Los Alamitos City Council via Resolution No. 2011-02 on February 7, 2011 for the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan.

APPROVAL CRITERIA: The Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1), Section 2.B (Land Use Summary by Phase) requires Planning Commission approval of a Site Plan Review to permit the construction of the Central Plant Structure.

NOTICING: The Public Hearing Notice for this meeting was mailed out on April 10, 2019, to property owners and commercial tenants within 500 feet of the subject parcel, and publicly posted at the City Hall, the Community Center, and the Los Alamitos Museum. Additionally, the Public Hearing Notice was published in the News Enterprise on April 10, 2019.

PRIOR ACTIONS: 2011 - Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan - ZOA 09-01, GPA 09-01, SP 09-01

BACKGROUND:
AJ Omar, on behalf of the Los Alamitos Medical Center, has submitted an application for the construction of a new two-story Central Plant (utility) structure proposed for an area of the hospital parking lot at the southeast intersection of Kaylor Street and Catalina Street -- see the attached site plan. The application asks approval to build a two-story, 11,619 square foot building and install a 56 feet tall Thermal Energy Storage (TES) water tank. The Planning Commission previously confirmed the proposition for this building to be in a different area and in a different phase than was originally approved in the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan. Please note that the project will also include the demolition of Medical Office Building (MOB) 1 on the same campus, near the northwest corner of Kaylor Street and Los Alamitos Boulevard, which will be replaced by additional surface parking. The proposed improvements also include a structure (referred to as the North Bridge/Screen Tower), which will carry the new utility connections from the new Central Plant across Kaylor Street to the existing medical center. Please refer to Attachment 1 for a project description provided by the Applicant.

During the September 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission considered and ultimately approved a proposal to modify the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan to create a Phase 2A and Phase 2B component to the Land Use Plan. Phase 2A consists of relocating the Central Plant from its current location at the southwest corner of Catalina Street and Kaylor Street to the southeast corner of Catalina and Kaylor Streets, the demolition of Medical Office Building 1 (a 24,000 square foot medical office building), and establishing additional surface parking in the place of MOB 1. Phase 2B will consist of a new four-story hospital tower and a new 6-level parking structure. Phase 3 was unchanged and consists of a second four-story hospital building, the demolition of the Administration/Warehouse Building (3776 & 3797 Catalina) which was originally planned for demolition in Phase 2 and surface parking in the area where the Central Plant is currently located.
You will notice that the center piece of the project is a large water tank that extends above the structure. Here is how the Applicant describes this tank:

“The proposed state-of-the-art Thermal Energy Storage (TES) system will significantly reduce energy consumption from the utility power grid during peak hours. This system generates chilled water during off peak hours, storing it for use later in the day. This system will reduce the potential for rolling blackouts for Los Alamitos Medical Center, and their direct community.

The proposed TES tank is factory fabricated and field assembled with high quality prefinished steel panels. The proposed design features two colors, in a composition which anchors the base of the tank in primarily gray panels, with more white panels used toward the upper portion. This visual strategy helps break the mass of the tank, and visually lightens its appearance. Also of note, the proposed tank will be located adjacent to existing facilities at Golden State Water tanks, directly across Kaylor Street. The proposed TES tank will integrate with the site by marrying its two-tone pattern and color with the CMU modules of adjacent buildings. This material marriage is intended to diffuse the massiveness of the tank to human scale while balancing the site on both sides of Kaylor Street.

Further softening of the proposed project is provided via increased landscaping; trees, shrubs and turf surround the perimeter, bringing eye pleasing greenery and desired shade.

Lastly the future patient tower will include a six-level parking structure that will fully conceal the TES tank from the south side, blocking any view from Katella Avenue. The remaining sides of the tank will be radically diffused by the Central Plant building.”

On the site plan (Attachment 8, sheet A-051) there are dashed lines shown around two other areas of the medical center that are not specifically mentioned in the scope of this project. One dashed line area is the existing emergency generators yard, which is to be demolished to accommodate miscellaneous emergency electrical substations, and the other dashed line area shows the existing electrical substation system cabinet or enclosure to be renovated.

DISCUSSION

Location

The proposed Central Plant site would be located in a current parking lot near the southeast corner of Kaylor Street and Catalina Street. The current Medical Office Building (MOB 1), to be demolished, is at the northwest corner of Kaylor Street and Katella Avenue. The North Bridge/Screen Tower will be constructed in a current
parking lot across Kaylor from the main hospital building. Here is the location of the proposed Central Plant:

The properties adjacent to the proposed Central Plant are developed and zoned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Central Plant for Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Site</td>
<td>Planned Light Industrial w/ Medical Overlay (P-M-MOZ)</td>
<td>Trend Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Site</td>
<td>Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1)</td>
<td>Parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Light Industrial w/ Medical Overlay (P-M-MOZ)</td>
<td>Deft. Touch Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Site</td>
<td>Planned Light Industrial w/ Medical Overlay (P-M-MOZ)</td>
<td>Current central plant and water company storage area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1)</td>
<td>Parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Site</td>
<td>Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1)</td>
<td>Parking lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Site Plan Review (SPR) 18-03*
Below are views of each section of the project area:

The Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1), Section 2.B (Land Use Summary by Phase) requires Planning Commission approval of a Site Plan Review to permit the construction of the Central Plant Structure.

The land use exhibits within the Specific Plan identify a conceptual level of the intended location and footprint of the uses proposed within the Medical Center campus. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any structure or improvement within the Specific Plan area, a site plan must be submitted for review by the City in accordance with Chapter 17.50 of the Municipal Code. A site plan for each phase is required.

The purpose of the site plan review procedure is to enable the Development Services Director to check development proposals for conformity with the provisions of the Specific Plan and zoning code, and to allow the director to impose conditions on the development or project as are necessary to bring it into conformity with the general
plan, surrounding development, and city policies and regulations with respect to on-site and off-site dedications and improvements.

The Site Plan Review is conducted by comparing the proposed project to applicable Specific Plan development standards, design guidelines, and other applicable City ordinances. The proposed project would be located in the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (LAMC – SP). The Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan allows for medical center/medical office/community service land uses, as described in the Land Use Plan. Below, are the development standards from the Specific Plan and the Staff response concerning each:

**Development Standards (Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan, Section 4.D.)**

1. **Intensity**

The floor area ratio within the Specific Plan area as a campus, including the medical center, existing and new medical office uses, and the central plant, based on gross acreage, shall not exceed 0.75.

**Staff Response:** The project is proposed to be a .55 FAR which does not exceed the intensity limit.

2. **General Development Standards**

Any area used for storage or equipment shall be visually screened and buffered in accordance with Section 17.16.130(C) of the Municipal Code which requires the screening of roof or ground mounted mechanical equipment, loading docks, refuse storage areas and utility services to be screened from public rights of way by a minimum six-foot high masonry wall or structure, the details of which shall be included in the required site plan submittal. Such screening shall be architecturally compatible with other on-site development in color, material and style. All lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the premises.
Staff Response: Screening, building walls, and fencing walls cover most of the utility items to be installed inside the central plant building complex. The architectural style is industrial modern, but with no certain descriptive label. Like most basic utility plants built today, its construction uses modern contemporary materials, interesting planes that step in and out, and decorative metal screening that take this structure beyond what could be a large, blank stucco box. It provides an interesting view for the public. It is anticipated that the building will become less prominent once other hospital buildings are constructed in the Specific Plan Area.

That said, the proposed project design results in a visual focus upon the Thermal Energy Storage (TES) water tank, which measures 45 feet in diameter and has an overall height of 56 feet. The proposed screening walls and the abutting building affords partial screening of the tank. Though the screening walls are taller than usual, the TES tank still extends well above them.

The tank elevation drawings show a “camouflage” type paint pattern, which is attempting to visually try to push the tank into the background. However, the size and magnitude of the tank remain a visual focus of the proposed plant. As currently presented, the tank is of prominent focus due to the height exceeding the abutting two story building. It should also be noted that the proposed tank is taller than the three existing Golden State Water tanks (36 feet tall) located directly across Kaylor Street from the project site.

Previous discussions with the project architect focused upon the possibility of “embellishing” the façade with a mural or incorporating materials, such as metal panels. For example, incorporating elements of the louvered aluminum architectural screen or metal mesh screening onto the tank exterior could help “soften” the visual impact. To date, the architect has reported to Staff that the Applicant is not supportive of these suggestions.

The North Bridge/Screen Tower is a structure to route and screen utility pipes and wires that cross over Kaylor Street. It will be explained later in the report as to why the above ground routing is proposed. The proposed structure is consistent with the applicable development standards.

The new parking lot where the proposed-to-be-demolished MOB 1 is located will have a parking booth that would be similar to the booths that were installed in phase 1 near the parking structure. The area will also see vehicular access improvements to the emergency room. Staff previously mentioned to the project architect that improved signage and minor exterior modifications would help provide appropriate visual attention to the emergency room entrance. The proposed new parking lot is consistent with the applicable development standards.
3. Height

Within the Los Alamitos Medical Center will be several new mid-rise structures including two four story hospital/patient care buildings, a three story medical office building, and four- and six-level parking structures. Maximum heights shall be as follows, measured from top of parapet to finished grade:

New Buildings: Maximum of four (4) stories or 70 feet (whichever is greater), measured to top of parapet.

The following structures may exceed the allowed height:

a. Plumbing vents, chimneys, etc.
b. Fire walls
c. Mechanical features such as air conditioners, tanks, fans and similar equipment located on rooftops must be screened, but the architectural features used to provide that screening are not considered as part of the building for purposes of determining building height, so long as features do not exceed the minimum amount required to achieve screening.
d. Skylights
e. Stair/Elevator structures
f. Solar panels
g. Architectural theme elements

Staff Response: The main 38 foot tall central plant structure is intended to screen and enclose most of the utility equipment and functions. However, the 56 foot tall Thermal Energy Storage (TES) water tank stands 18 feet taller than the main structure and is absent of any screening, other than the proposed paint scheme. This tank would project/extend above the building and screen walls by approximately 18 feet, and extend above by 27 feet above the screen wall on the south side elevation. For comparison, the existing hospital parking structure is also 56 feet tall. The Golden State Water tanks across Kaylor Street from this location are at a height of 36 feet.

With its large size, Staff understands that the tank would be costly to fully screen. The screening that is proposed is at a low height around the tank, intended to mask the less than pleasant equipment installed to serve the tank versus the tank itself. The tallest height of the main structures is 41½ feet to a screen on a parapet. The building and tank will not exceed the maximum height for the Specific Plan. Additionally, it should be noted that future proposed development to the south include a parking structure and patient tower. Once installed, it is anticipated that the water tower will be essentially blocked from view to the south.

The following are photos, provided by the applicant of a TES water tank:
Here is an example of what camouflage painted tanks look like:

4. Setbacks

The following are required minimum building setbacks for new construction in the Specific Plan area:

Katella Avenue: 10 feet, Cherry Street: 10 feet, Catalina Street: 10 feet, Florista Street: 10 feet, Bloomfield Avenue: 10 feet, Kaylor Street: 5 feet, On-site: Rear Yard: none, Side Yard: none. Perimeter street setbacks shall be measured from the right-of-way line. Projections into required setbacks shall be allowed in accordance with the Municipal Code and may include columns.

Staff Response: The minimum setback requirements are met. The Kaylor Street setback is at five (5) feet while the Catalina setback is well beyond the required ten (10) feet. The rear yard and side yards do not require setbacks.
5. Building Separation

Internal Buildings with the Medical Center Campus: Minimum building separation shall be provided in accordance with the IBC/UBC requirements. Adjacent buildings outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan: 10 feet

Staff Response: All other buildings on the campus are well beyond 10 feet in separation from any part of this building.

6. Landscaping Requirements

All landscaping and irrigation systems and plans shall conform to the requirements of the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code and incorporate drought tolerant plants. A California licensed landscape architect shall prepare all landscape drawings and plans, and oversee the installation of all plantings and landscape materials within the project.

a. Parking Lot Landscaping. Each off-street open surface parking lot shall provide an area, or areas, landscaped equivalent to twenty (20) square feet for each parking space and shall include one fifteen (15) gallon tree for each one thousand five hundred (1500) square feet of parking area. Required landscaping may be provided in any of the following areas: along the periphery of the parking area, internal to the parking areas within plazas or other common landscaped areas of the Specific Plan.

b. Site Plan Review Submittal. A landscape plan for the campus shall be provided at the time of site plan review for review and approval by the Development Services Director. Fifteen (15) percent of the site shall be in landscaped areas. The landscape area requirement may include setback areas and other unused areas of the site that are not intended for future use.

Staff Response: These requirements are either met or would be reiterated by Staff in the landscape section of the resolution. The Applicant has identified the following with regard to the proposed landscaping:

"The plans show the required 15% landscaping and project compliance requirements; see the colored site plan and calculation breakdown, attached. The south and east side of the project will be planted with trees (Majestic Beauty, Bottle Tree, African Sumac, Brisbane Box), shrubs (Wax Leaf Privet, Bird of Paradise, New Gold Lantana) and ground cover (Dwarf Cool Season Turf) to complement existing species within site. A full set of landscape plans will be submitted to the city for review and approval as soon as the project is approved by the city planning."

7. Fencing

Any and all fencing and walls installed as part of this project shall conform to the requirements of the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code.
Staff Response: Some of the walls installed as screening in this proposed plan exceed seven (7) feet in height, but can be approved as part of this review of the Planning Commission. These walls, since they exceed six feet in height, are all made of masonry material. The proposed wall fence will surround the Central Plant site to limit public access to the building. It will be constructed of CMU vertically split precision block with stacked pattern.

8. Parking Requirements

a. Off-Street Parking Requirements

Parking is calculated in accordance with the ratios established by the Municipal Code which requires for the Central Plant 1 space per 500 square feet (gross). At the time of site plan review the parking requirement for the Central Plant shall be determined based upon the floor plans for the final design, calculated at the Central Plant ratio identified above. If no office space is present, no parking will be required. The Applicant shows three (3) spaces within the walled off area of the plant.

Staff Response:
As a result of the table being small and difficult to read, the parking numbers and how they are affected by this project for the entire Specific Plan area are presented as a separate document. Please see attachment 2 to this report.

Additionally, the Applicant has submitted a redlined, revised, parking plan from the Specific Plan to show how the parking will change through the new 2A and 2B Phases. The new parking lot, when completed, will provide more public parking as well as a more prominent access/drop off area for the emergency room. It will also have a Parking Booth to enable collection of parking fees.

In the Municipal Code, there is a loading space requirement for the Central Plant Building of one 12 by 20 feet parking space (LAMC 17.26.100). If later approved, Staff would draft a condition to meet this standard.

During the construction of the proposed project, parking will not be available in the areas for the Central Plant, around the North Bridge/Screen Tower, and parking area where MOB 1 is proposed to be removed; however, the existing parking structure was overbuilt to accommodate the parking taken up by these projects while they are constructed. There also continues to be a hospital shuttle that moves visitors around the campus from parking areas to the buildings.

b. In accordance with Title 24 of the California Building Code, handicapped parking spaces shall be provided and located as close to the buildings as is feasible.

Staff Response: The ADA spaces and the path of travel to them are demonstrated on the site plan and would be conditioned to be designed to meet the ADA code in a resolution of approval.
c. The parking space size for this project shall be 9-feet wide by 19-feet long for open parking lot areas and 9-feet wide by 18-feet long within parking structures.

  **Staff Response:** The new parking spaces meet this requirement.

d. Parking for disabled persons shall be provided in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

  **Staff Response:** See requirement “b” above.

e. A minimum width of 24 feet shall be provided for two-way drive aisles of parking areas.

  **Staff Response:** All of the new drive aisles are proposed to be constructed to the required 24 feet width.

9. Signage

Signage within the Specific Plan area shall conform to the Los Alamitos Signage ordinance, Chapter 17.28 of the Municipal Code or an adopted sign program approved by the Development Services Director.

  **Staff Response:** No signage is proposed at this time.

10. Development Standards Modifications

A significant deviation for development standards may be allowed only by action of the City Council. The Council may grant one or more modifications only if the following findings of fact can be made:

a. The modification(s) is necessary to properly implement a physically and economically viable project; and,

b. The modification(s) would ensure compliance with the general purpose and intent of the adopted specific plan.

  **Staff Response:** No modifications are requested.

NOISE

The Applicant has submitted a Noise study with the application, authored by CSDA Design Group, which is attached to this report. Here is the conclusion paragraph of the noise study:

“Based on our ambient noise survey, the criteria presented in Section 3.0 and our analysis of Phase One and Phase Two, the project will satisfy the City’s property line noise limit of 70 dBA. Although not required for Code compliance, the calculated noise level at the nearest facade of the future hospital is less than 65 dBA. This is expected to allow the suggested interior noise criterion of 45 dBA to
be satisfied in the future hospital with typical facade construction methods and materials."

**NORTH BRIDGE/SCREEN TOWER**

This is a structure that is intended to screen connective wires and pipes that cross Kaylor Street. Here is the response from the Architect explaining why the North Bridge/Screen Tower is necessary, and why the infrastructure is not remaining underground when it crosses Kaylor Street:

"Kaylor Street is congested with existing utilities spanning north south from Catalina to tie into Katella Avenue main utility services:

a. Domestic water services: Existing water lines ranging from 6 to 8 inches springing from Golden State Water and branching out through Kaylor.
b. Sanitary Sewer Services: Existing sewer lines ranging from 8 to 12 inches connecting Katella Ave to Catalina Street.
c. Storm Drainage Services: Existing Storm line ranging from 8 to 12 inches connecting Katella Ave to Catalina Street.
d. Edison electrical Services: various Edison conduits and conductors connecting Katella Ave to Catalina Street.
e. Telecom Services: Existing telecom services are also spanning the length of Kaylor Street.
f. Underground water table is notably high at this site, varying from 4 to 15 feet below grade.
g. All the mentioned above existing utilities are located at various elevations and depths below grade.

Our initial approach to providing infrastructure support to the existing hospital from the proposed Central Plant was to be underground; it is convenient, less costly and invisible. The project team’s utility investigations (detailed above) provided a scenario where crossing Kaylor Street below grade would be unworkable. Spanning Kaylor with approximately 16 pipes (electrical conduit, chilled water lines, medical vacuum, IT, etc., while avoiding existing utility lines
would necessitate locating the new utilities significantly low, subjecting them to underground water, causing rapid deterioration, and extremely difficult repair access.

Please note the proposed Central Plant is a critical use building, designed with a state-mandated structural high importance factor, to maintain operation during emergencies, delivering uninterrupted infrastructure support to both the existing hospital and future patient tower. Therefore, burying the proposed utilities deep underground to evade the existing public and private utilities will cause complications identifying and accessing failed system(s), and allowing the much-needed repairs during emergencies.

The North Bridge/Screening Tower will be constructed using much of the same screening material that will be used on the Central Plant building. Metal mesh will cover the view into the area where the infrastructure passes across, but will be a bit transparent, giving an interesting modern industrial look. Staff notes that it looks a bit like a monorail track with its concrete columns and span across the street. The clearance would be 14 feet 6 inches, allowing for fire trucks and most other vehicles to pass underneath. The required code clearance is 13 feet 6 inches.

**NEW PARKING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF KATELLA AND KAYLOR ST**
A new parking lot will be created to replace the current location of Medical Office Building (MOB) 1 when it is demolished. This parking area will also act as the vehicle entrance and parking for the emergency room. During construction, the emergency room parking will be relocated as shown on a site plan in the color copies attached to this report.

OSHPD

This project falls under the purview of OSHPD, which is California’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development. They ensure that hospital buildings are safe, offer financial assistance to individuals and healthcare institutions, and collect and publish healthcare data. The City’s Building Department will not have jurisdiction over the project, this project will be plan-checked and inspected for safety by OSHPD.

SPECIFIC PLAN

As proposed, the project is somewhat consistent with the Specific Plan designation and its applicable goals, except for those goals highlighted in yellow. See these goals here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of the Specific Plan</th>
<th>How Goals Are Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comply with the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Goals and Policies.</td>
<td>See the table below this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design the project with consideration of the site’s circulation, environmental, and physical opportunities and constraints.</td>
<td>The proposed project is consistent with the original intent of these subjects as created in the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create project identity through thematically coherent and aesthetically pleasing architecture, landscaped areas, colors, signage, and entry statements outlined in project design guidelines and implemented through the site plan review process.</td>
<td>Though serving a utility function, the proposed Central Plant generally has a complimentary architectural design that will continue cohesion between the project elements of the Specific Plan. However the focal point of the project would be the water tank. As currently proposed, the tank would not be aesthetically pleasing considering the extent of its exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size and phase the medical center development plan to satisfy, and be consistent with, current and anticipated future market demand.</td>
<td>This project is proposed primarily to satisfy current market demand for the hospital, as well as for the increased demand that will be required for the future Specific Plan projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage a streamlined and predictable discretionary review process for subsequent reviews</td>
<td>This proposed project originally strayed away from the Specific Plan, and has changed through various architectural iterations, therefore the process for this approval has been quite lengthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for coordinated land use, urban design, landscape, transportation, and infrastructure planning.</td>
<td>The site Plan Review process does in fact provide a structure for this coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a sustainable development that minimizes short term and long term adverse environmental impacts to the fullest extent feasible and adequately addresses consumer</td>
<td>This project is being proposed precisely to be ready to create utility capacity for future projects at the medical center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of the Specific Plan needs.</td>
<td>How Goals Are Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the local job market by providing a substantial number of permanent new jobs within and available to the local community.</td>
<td>This project is planned to make possible the future phases of the Specific Plan, and those phases will create more jobs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is how the proposed project compares to General Plan Policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies of the General Plan</th>
<th>How Policies are Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Circulation Element</td>
<td>In an effort to maintain parking levels for future specific plan projects, this project removes a medical office building on the campus in order to replace the parking removed for the central plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities and Safety Element</td>
<td>The proposed project was improved through a cooperation between the City and the Los Alamitos Medical Center to ensure compliance with the Center’s Specific Plan. However, Staff believes that the project as currently proposed does not represent an aesthetic that meets the requirements of the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 5.3 Public facilities. Provide adequate on-site parking at public facilities for daily and event-based activities, especially in the downtown and medical center areas.

Policy 5.2 Los Alamitos Medical Center. Maintain and enhance a collaborative relationship with Los Alamitos Medical Center and other medical service providers to best serve the community, create healthy communities, and maintain and attract a skilled workforce.

**CONCLUSION**

As currently proposed, Staff does not recommend approval of the project at this juncture due to the aesthetic impact of the proposed water tank. The water tank is substantial in size with minimal screening proposed to help soften its prominent focus. When installed, it will be clearly seen from all angles. Staff does understand that the future parking structure and patient tower would cover some of the view from Katella Avenue, but it is uncertain as to when these structures will be established.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission keep the public hearing open and continue the Applicant’s project (Site Plan Review 18-03) to the May meeting in order to give the Applicant additional time to further explore options for screening/disguising the TES tank.

**Attachments:**

1. Applicant Description of Project
2. Parking Numbers Matrix
3. Redlined Parking Plan
4. Noise Study
5. Fly-over Video – view at: https://vimeo.com/326703893
6. Colored Elevations & Miscellaneous Concept Elevations- of future hospital Expansions
7. Letter from Kent Clayton - concerning future hospital phases
8. Large Plans (28” x 40”)
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ATTACHMENT A
LOS ALAMITOS MEDICAL CENTER
Central Plant Site Plan Review
Project Description

BACKGROUND

The Los Alamitos Medical Center hospital was constructed in 1968 and the Medical Center Campus has been modified several times. Four medical offices, a Total Care Pavilion, and a garage structure have been constructed as the campus has expanded.

The existing Medical Center provides medical care to over 100,000 patients each year, with over 88% of admissions from within an eight-mile radius. The facility is a top employer in Los Alamitos, and supports local services through utility, property, first function uses, and sales taxes. As an acute care hospital, Los Alamitos Medical Center serves an essential function in the community.

In 2011, the Los Alamitos City Council certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopted the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan to provide for the phased expansion and modernization of the Medical Center Campus. The EIR assumed the phased implementation of Medical Center Campus improvements including medical offices, a hospital expansion, a parking structure, and a new Central Plant. The Specific Plan identified a net increase of 164 beds, and a 14,000 square-foot Central Plant. The first phase - a medical office and parking structure - has been constructed and is a successful addition to the campus and the City. The Specific Plan contemplated two new bed towers and a Central Plant to be constructed in the second and third phases. The Specific Plan contemplated the Central Plant was to be located on Catalina Street.

PROPOSED PROJECT

- The current project is proposed to address needed improvements to utility component systems related to the age, location, function, and operating capacity of the systems. Many of the components are over 50 years old and are dispersed around and on the roof of the Medical Center. The Los Alamitos Medical Center administration is taking preventative steps to replace such systems and centralize them in one location as one new, fully integrated Central Plant that is modern, efficient and purposefully located within the campus to be a good neighbor to its community.
  There are numerous technical code-related reasons that make the construction of the Central Plant a critical need for the hospital; many of the utility systems cannot be upgraded in place. These technical constraints are outlined in Attachment 1 of this Project Description. Plans for the Central Plant must be processed and approved through the State of California Office of State Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). Although the City does not have discretionary approval authority, the project does require site plan review and approval by the City. This application is for Site Plan review. Attached plans include the site plans, building elevations, grading plan and a landscape plan.
- Demolish a two-story Medical Office Building MOB #1, and construct surface parking as promised in the approved Specific Plans.

Location.

- The proposed Central Plant would be sited on the periphery of the Medical Center Campus just north east of the off-site existing water tanks owned by Golden State Water (South/ East corner of Kaylor St./ Catalina St.).
Surface Parking – Demolishing MOB #1 is located on the North/West corner of Katella Ave./Kaylor St.

**Central Utility Plant is an Essential Facility.** The 11,829 square-foot Central Plant is proposed as a free-standing, 2-story building of Type II-B construction. The Central Plant is designed to serve the existing hospital (167 bed/121,748 sf) and a proposed future patient hospital tower. The Central Plant siting accommodates the future location of the bed tower south of the proposed central plant. A new Central Plant is a critical facility supporting the emergency power, chilled water, and other needs of the existing and future hospital uses.

The features of the Central Plant include the following:

- Centralizing and upgrading the Electrical Emergency power.
- Centralizing and upgrading the Site electrical.
- Centralizing and upgrading the chilled water and cooling systems.
- Centralizing and upgrading the Boilers and Medical gases systems.
- Centralizing and upgrading the facility management and control systems.
- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions by increasing systems efficiency and installing a TES system (Thermal Energy Storage).

**Utilities Paths:**

- The wet utilities serving the existing hospital will exit the Central Utility Plant south west side (below grade) and continue directly underground and head south parallel to Kaylor St. and then daylight at the utility bridge base to span Kaylor Street through a screened utility bridge.

- The dry utilities serving the existing hospital will exit the Central Utility Plant south east side (below grade) through underground concrete banks and head south between the adjacent property (Aircraft Windshield Company) and the future Garage and then head west to connect to the utility bridge.

- All future patient tower will terminate underground just south of the Central Utility Plant.
B. Parking Plan

A total of up to 1,966 on-site parking spaces will be provided within the Specific plan Area at build-out, configured in surface and structured parking areas. Parking will be provided at ratios that meet or exceed the parking standards of the Specific Plan Development Regulations as shown in Table 3, Parking Requirements, based on the anticipated phased build-out of the project. The final parking requirement will be based on the parking ratios outlined in the Development Regulations of this Specific Plan, calculated at the time of final site plan review, and thus may vary slightly based on final square footages. Parking would be on a paid basis, with employee parking provided at no charge. Employees would take access to the parking areas and/or structure(s) via separate controlled entry points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Main Hospital</td>
<td>121,748</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing MOB 1 (interim until demolished in Phase 2)</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing MOB 2 (unaltered)</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing MOB 3 (unaltered)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Total Care Pavilion (unaltered)</td>
<td>71,576</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Administration/Warehouse Building (interim until demolished in Phase 2)</td>
<td>15,099</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Medical Office Building A</td>
<td>75,100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1796 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Phase 1 (Stand Alone)</strong></td>
<td>431,623</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,796 1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Main Hospital (internal reconfiguration with bed count reduction)</td>
<td>(no change)</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-94 Reduction due to reduced bed count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hospital/patient care building 1</td>
<td>88,100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of MOB 1</td>
<td>-24,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Administration/Warehouse Bldg.</td>
<td>-15,099</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Phase 2 (net)</td>
<td>49,001</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Total Phase 2</strong></td>
<td>480,624</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hospital/patient care building 2</td>
<td>88,100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Central Plant</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Phase 3</strong></td>
<td>102,200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILD-OUT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>582,824</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking ratios: Hospital (1.75 spaces/bed), Medical Office (5 spaces/1,000 sf), Office (4 spaces/1,000 sf), warehouse (1 space/1,000 sf), Central Plant (1 space/500 sf)

* At the time of site plan review the parking requirement for the Central Plant shall be determined based upon the floor plans for the final design, calculated at a the Central Plant ratio identified in the Development Regulations of this document. If no office space is present, no parking will be required.

** Proposed Central Plant do not have office spaces.
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1.0 Executive Summary

CSDA has completed a noise emission study to determine compliance with applicable acoustical criteria, and potential impact on the future hospital tower to be constructed 170 feet south of the Los Alamitos Medical Center (LAMC) Central Utility Plant (CUP). The following summarizes our findings:

- The existing environmental noise levels at the nearest property line range from $L_{eq}$ 56 dBA to 63 dBA\(^1\). The calculated day/night average sound level ranged between $L_{dn}$\(^2\) 65 dBA to $L_{dn}$ 67 dBA.

- Based on our analysis, CUP equipment noise levels will not exceed 70 dBA at the nearest property lines, which is an industrial property, therefore, the project will comply with the City of Los Alamitos Municipal Code.

- CUP equipment noise levels will comply with the City Municipal Code requirements at the nearby Los Alamitos Elementary School and residential property lines based on the results for our analysis.

- Although not required for code compliance, we recommend an interior noise criterion of 45 dBA be applied for the patient rooms in the new Patient Tower due to exterior noise intrusion, based upon The Guidelines for Design and Construction of Health Care Facilities (2014 edition)\(^3\) published by the Facility Guidelines Institute (FGI). To meet this criterion, we recommend the noise generated by the cooling towers not exceed 65 dBA at the nearest façade of the future hospital. Based on our analysis, CUP equipment noise levels will not exceed this criterion with the following design elements and noise mitigation measures.
  - 21’-6” tall equipment screen consisting of acoustic louvers similar to Kinetics KCAC-3.
  - Super Low Sound Fans installed on all three Evapco cooling towers.

2.0 Project Description

CSDA understands the project is a new ground up Central Utility Plant (CUP), located on Los Alamitos Medical Center property across Kaylor Street from the main hospital. The facility is designed to provide all utilities except medical gas (utilizing chillers, boilers, cooling towers, pumps, generators and emergency generators) for the existing 167 bed hospital and the planned new Patient Tower.

We have analyzed two (2) phases of development.
   a) Phase One: CUP serving the existing hospital.
   b) Phase Two: CUP serving the existing hospital and the new Patient Tower.

---

\(^1\) $L_{eq}$: The equivalent continuous sound level which would contain the same sound energy as the time varying sound level over time $t$.

\(^2\) Day/Night Average Sound Level ($L_{dn}$ or DNL): A descriptor established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to describe the average day-night level with a 10 dB penalty applied to noise occurring during the nighttime hours (10 pm to 7 am) to account for the increased sensitivity of people during sleeping hours. A 10 dB increase in sound level is perceived by people to be twice as loud.

\(^3\) http://www.fgiguideLines.org/
Based on Figure 1-3 in the City’s General Plan, the project and neighboring parcels are zoned P-M (Planned Light Industrial). The project is located approximately within 525 feet of a commercial zone, 590 feet of a residential zone and 760 feet of Los Alamitos Elementary School.

The noise producing equipment in the proposed CUP includes:

- Ground Level (open to sky)
  - Three (3) emergency generators
- 1st Floor (enclosed)
  - Three boilers
  - Three chillers
  - 17 pumps
- 2nd Floor (enclosed)
  - Medical vacuum pump
  - Medical air compressor
- Roof (open to sky)
  - Three (3) cooling towers and two sweepers, enclosed with an equipment screen consisting of acoustic louvers on the north, west and south walls.

CSDA conducted a noise emission study to calculate the future noise levels produced by the CUP and provide noise mitigation recommendations to comply with applicable acoustical criteria.

## 3.0 Acoustical Criteria

### 3.1 Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan (SP 09-1)

The Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan⁴, adopted February 2011, contains the following policies/actions applicable to this project:

- **Specific Plan Goals**
  - Comply with the City of Los Alamitos General Plan Goals and Policies
  - Design the project with consideration of the site’s circulation, environmental, and physical opportunities and constraints.

- **Site Planning**
  - Loading, delivery service areas, outdoor storage, standalone mechanical facilities, should be located and designed to minimize their visibility, circulation conflicts and adverse noise impacts. Sound attenuation walls should be used where appropriate to reduce noise where required by code or the project’s environmental analysis.

### Applicable General Plan Implementing Goals and Policies and Consistency of Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 6-2.1: Potential noise impacts due to stationary sources should be mitigated in the planning stage.</th>
<th>Consistent. The impacts of project-related noise have been evaluated as part of the environmental review process for the proposed project and shall comply with the General Plan Noise Element, Municipal Codes Section 17.24.020(d) requirements, recommended mitigation measures, and the acoustical Significance Criteria and Incremental Effects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

⁴ [http://cityoflosalamitos.org/?wpfb_dl=303](http://cityoflosalamitos.org/?wpfb_dl=303)
3.2 Los Alamitos General Plan

The Los Alamitos General Plan\(^5\), adopted March 2015, contains the following policies/actions applicable to this project:

- **GOAL 4**: An environment in which minimized noise contributes to the public’s health, safety, and welfare.

- **POLICY 4.1 Land Use Compatibility**: Approve development and require mitigation measures to ensure existing and future land use compatibility as shown in the City’s Noise Ordinance, the Land Use and Noise Compatibility Matrix, the State Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, and the Airport Environ Land Use Plan for the JFTB.

- **POLICY 4.3 Control Sound at the Source**: Prioritize noise mitigation measures to control sound at the source over buffers, sound walls, and other perimeter measures.

- **POLICY 4.4 Noise Impacts**: Minimize or eliminate persistent, periodic, or impulsive noise impacts of business operations.

3.3 Los Alamitos and Orange County Municipal Code

The following items from Chapter 17.24\(^6\) of the Los Alamitos Municipal Code are applicable to this project.

- Exterior and Interior Noise Standards (Sections 17.24.050 and 17.24.070) The following noise standards, unless otherwise specifically indicated, shall apply to all real property within a designated noise zone:


\(^6\) [http://gcode.us/codes/losalamitos/](http://gcode.us/codes/losalamitos/)
Prohibited Exterior Noise Levels (Section 17.24.060). It is unlawful or a person to create noise or to allow the creation of noise on property owned, leased, occupied, or otherwise controlled by a person, that causes the noise level when measured on a residential, public institutional, professional, commercial or industrial property, either within or without the city, to exceed the applicable noise standard. The noise levels at the affected property shall not exceed:

1. The noise standard for a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour; or
2. The noise standard plus 5 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour; or
3. The noise standard plus 10 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour; or
4. The noise standard plus 15 dBA for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or
5. The noise standard plus 20 dBA for any period of time.

Maximum Allowable Noise Levels (Section 17.24.060.B). In the event the ambient noise level exceeds the noise limit categories listed above, the cumulative period applicable to the category shall be increased to reflect the ambient noise level. In the event the ambient noise level exceeds the fifth noise limit category (noise standard plus 20 dBA), the maximum allowable noise level under that category shall be increased to reflect the maximum ambient noise level.

Exemptions. A mechanical device, apparatus, or equipment used, related to or connected with emergency machinery, vehicle or work.

Note: This is interpreted by the design team to include the emergency generators proposed for this project.

### 3.4 Facility Guidelines Institute

The CUP will be designed to serve the existing bed hospital as well as the new Patient Tower that will be completed in the second phase as described in the Los Alamitos Medical Center Specific Plan. We understand the future Patient Tower will be located within 34 feet of the CUP building footprint.

The Guidelines for Design and Construction of Health Care Facilities (2014 edition)\(^7\) published by the Facility Guidelines Institute (FGI) contains policies/actions that can be applied to this project, as the California Building Code/OSHPD\(^8\) does not address environmental noise intrusion.

Table 2 presents the minimum and maximum design criteria for noise in interior spaces.

---

\(^7\) [http://www.fgi-guidelines.org/](http://www.fgi-guidelines.org/)

\(^8\) OSHPD: California’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) is the leader in collecting data and disseminating information about California’s healthcare infrastructure.
Table 2: FGI Guidelines Minimum and Maximum Design Criteria for Noise in Interior Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Type</th>
<th>NC / RC(N) / RNC</th>
<th>dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient rooms</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>35-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple occupant patient care areas</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICU(^1)</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating rooms(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors and public spaces</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing/research lab, minimal speech(^2)</td>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research lab, extensive speech(^2)</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>45-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group teaching lab</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s offices, exam rooms</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>35-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference rooms</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconferencing rooms</td>
<td>25 (max)</td>
<td>30 (max)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, large lecture rooms</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) NICU building mechanical noise levels were set for compliance with Guidelines requirements when added to NICU activity noise

\(^2\) See A1.2-6.1.4 for recommended ranges for operating rooms.

\(^3\) See the white paper “Sound and Vibration Design Guidelines for Health Care Facilities” (January 1, 2010) posted at www.fgiguide.com for a discussion of room noise rating criteria. Also see A1.2-6.1.4 (Room noise levels in operating rooms).

\(^4\) One rating system shall be chosen to evaluate room noise levels, and noise from building mechanical systems shall be evaluated using that single rating system.

Although the future hospital has not yet been designed, the exterior noise level at the nearest facade to the CUP should be reduced so the interior noise criteria, presented in Table 2, can be achieved using typical construction methods and materials. Typical construction practices and materials can usually provide 20-25 dBA of noise reduction.

3.5 Criteria Summary

Based on the above, the following summarizes the design noise criteria for this project:

- **Noise generated by the CUP should not exceed the following:**
  - **Exterior,** 70 dBA should not be exceeded at the nearest Industrial property line. We understand the footprint of the CUP will be within 70 feet of this property line. Presently, this is the most stringent exterior noise criterion for this project. As stated in Section 3.3, the maximum allowable property line noise level may increase if the measured ambient exceeds the noise limit categories presented in 17.24.060 of the City’s Municipal Code.
  - **Interior,** A noise level of 45 dBA should not be exceeded in the patient rooms of the new hospital tower. This is based on the FGI guidelines and the City’s interior, nighttime noise criteria for residences. Although the future hospital tower is not zoned as residential, the interior noise criterion of 45 dBA is derived from sleep disturbance studies, which is applicable to patient rooms.
4.0 Ambient Noise Measurements

Noise measurements were conducted to quantify the existing environmental noise levels at the site. The following discusses the measurements and results.

4.1 Weather

During the measurements, the maximum wind speed was 9 miles per hour (mph); wind noise did not affect the measurements. The temperature ranged from a low of 48°F to a high of 64°F, and the humidity level ranged from a low of 44% to a high of 100%, with no precipitation.

4.2 General Noise Conditions

The measured noise environment is primarily influenced by mechanical noise associated with surrounding industrial facilities and local vehicular traffic on Kaylor Street, Catalina Street and Kyle Street. Minor noise sources include onsite traffic noise, birds, and general city noise.

4.3 Noise Measurement Results

To long-term (i.e., 24 hour) measurements were conducted at the project site from December 13 to 14, 2018. The long term measurements were taken in secured lock boxes 12 feet above the ground. Measurements commenced at 10:00 AM on December 13 and ended at 11:46 AM on December 14.

The equipment was calibrated immediately before and after the measurements with no significant drift in response. Figure 1 shows the measurement locations, and Table 3 summarizes the noise measurement results.

![Map of Noise Measurement Locations](image)

*Figure 1: Long Term (LT) Measurement Locations LT-1 and LT-2*
Table 3: Noise Measurement Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Location</th>
<th>L_{den}</th>
<th>Daytime Noisiest Hour, dBA</th>
<th>Nighttime Noisiest Hour, dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT-1: Eastern Property Line</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-2: Near Northern Property Line</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LT = Long-term meter, 12’ height

Figure 2 and Figure 3 present the time-history results in hourly intervals at locations LT-1 and LT-2, respectively. The City’s noise standard for industrial land use is shown as well. The measured ambient noise levels did not exceed the City’s noise standard (70 dBA) for industrial land uses during the long-term measurement. Therefore, according to section 17.24.060 of the City’s Municipal Code, the applicable property line noise standard at the eastern property line is 70 dBA.
5.0 Noise Level Calculation Methodology

In order to calculate the future noise levels of the proposed CUP, we used three-dimensional noise modeling software (CadnaA). The model incorporates the geometry of the project site and the adjacent buildings, and accounts for site-specific acoustical characteristics (e.g., acoustical louvers, reflected noise from neighboring buildings). The model was created based on the architectural drawings received December 11, 2018 and the topographical survey. The noise sources in the model were based on the manufacturers' published sound data for the mechanical equipment. Where manufacturer's sound data was not available, representative sound data was used based on the specifications of the equipment.

The height of the cooling tower enclosure, consisting of acoustic louvers, is 21-1/2 feet above the roof. We used the insertion loss associated with Kinetics KCAC-3 acoustical louvers with a depth of 24" for the north, west and south walls of the equipment enclosure. The acoustic model includes sound data with the Evapco cooling towers outfitted with the manufacturer's Super Low Sound Fan.

Our analysis was broken into two phases:
- Phase One: CUP serving the existing hospital.
- Phase Two: CUP serving the existing hospital and the new Patient Tower.

Table 4 summarizes the assumptions/inputs into the noise model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Modeled Unit</th>
<th>Noise Level, dBA</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Operating Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiler</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boiler Rm</td>
<td>Burnham 4SPW-200</td>
<td>87.5 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Noise Control for Buildings and Manufacturing Plants⁹</td>
<td>Two at full load, one on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump (Boiler Rm)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boiler Rm</td>
<td>Weg Pump Motor</td>
<td>69 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Six at full load, three on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiller Rm</td>
<td>York YMC2-S1934AB</td>
<td>73 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Two at full load, one on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump (Chiller Rm)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chiller Rm</td>
<td>Weg Pump Motor</td>
<td>69 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Six at full load, three on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling Tower with enclosure*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rooftop</td>
<td>Evapco AT 122-3N20, Super Low Sound Fan</td>
<td>Top: 71@5ft Sides: 78@5ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Two at full speed, one on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rooftop</td>
<td>Weg, 10hp electric motor</td>
<td>72 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>One at full load, one on standby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Vacuum Pumps</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Med Vac/Air</td>
<td>BeaconMedaes VHS10T-200V-Q</td>
<td>90 @ 3.3ft</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Four at full load</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 Results and Analysis

6.1 Phase One Noise Levels - CUP Serving Existing Hospital

We have analyzed both daytime and nighttime noise levels for Phase One. **No mitigation is necessary to meet the City noise criteria for Phase One.**

Table 5 summarizes the results of our Phase One calculations at the property lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Land Use</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Ambient Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Equipment Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Cumulative Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Criteria (dBA)</th>
<th>Meets Criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 is a noise contour map of the calculated equipment noise levels at a height of 10 feet for Phase 1.
6.2 Phase Two Noise Levels - CUP Serving the Existing Hospital and the New Patient Tower

We have analyzed both daytime and nighttime noise levels for Phase Two. **No mitigation is necessary to meet the City noise criteria for Phase Two.** Mitigation is also not necessary to meet our suggested criterion of 65 dBA at the north façade of the future hospital (to achieve the 45 dBA interior noise level criterion).

Table 6 summarizes the results of our Phase Two calculations at the property lines:

**Table 6: Phase Two Property Line Noise Levels at Height of 10 Feet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Land Use</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Ambient Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Equipment Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Cumulative Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Criteria (dBA)</th>
<th>Meets Criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Property Line: Industrial</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Hospital:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Night</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>65*</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Floor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Floor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CSDA’s suggested criterion at hospital façade to allow standard construction to satisfy FGI interior noise criterion of 45 dBA

Figure 5 is a noise contour map of the calculated equipment noise levels at a height of 10 feet for Phase 2.

![Figure 5: Calculated Equipment Noise Levels – Phase Two – CUP Serving Existing Hospital and New Patient Tower](image)

Table 5 and Figure 6 show the calculated equipment noise levels at the nearest property lines and at each floor of the future hospital’s north façade will comply with the project criteria.
6.3 General Noise Mitigation Recommendations

Our analysis assumed all doors were closed and properly sealed. If the doors of the CUP are left open the City’s property line criteria may be exceeded. Since doors are often the acoustical ‘weak link’ in a composite wall construction, we recommend the following:

- Closed Doors. The CUP should be designed to allow necessary ventilation for proposed equipment to eliminate the need for open or louvered doors for equipment cooling.
- Sealing Steel Doors. All exterior steel doors should have perimeter seals (Pemko S-88) and a drop seal (Pemko 434A/420A) to maintain the acoustical integrity of the door. The acoustical performance of a door without proper seals is severely degraded.
- Sealing Roll-Up Doors. All roll-up doors should be fitted with weather seals at bottom and interior side guides, so the door can seal tightly against the structure when closed.

7.0 Conclusion

Based on our ambient noise survey, the criteria presented in Section 3.0 and our analysis of Phase One and Phase Two, the project will satisfy the City’s property line noise limit of 70 dBA. Although not required for Code compliance, the calculated noise level at the nearest facade of the future hospital is less than 65 dBA. This is expected to allow the suggested interior noise criterion of 45 dBA to be satisfied in the future hospital with typical facade construction methods and materials.

This concludes our environmental noise study for Los Alamitos Medical Center CUP; please contact us with questions.
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March 20, 2019

City of Los Alamitos Planning Department
3191 Katella Ave.
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Attention:  Tom Oliver, Associate Planner

RE: Central Utility Plant

Dear Tom:

This letter is in reference to the request for additional information as it relates to the Central Utility Plant (CUP) and future campus development.

At this time, we have engaged our Architects to begin the conceptual plans and drawings as it relates to the demolition of the Medical Office Building on Kaylor and Katella. The demolition would take place approximately six (6) months after receiving OSHPD approval for the CUP project.

Our Architects have also been engaged with developing the conceptual plans and drawings for the Patient Tower and Parking Structure. As you are very well aware, this process is extensive and requires substantial time and financial investment. Nevertheless, our intent is to submit a complete application to the City of Los Alamitos for site plan review prior to the February 2021 deadline (10th anniversary of the adopted Specific Plan).

I appreciate the Planning Commission’s support as we improve our campus and physical plant.

Sincerely,

Kent Clayton
Chief Executive Officer
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---

DEFERRED APPROVALS

- [List of deferred approvals]

---

ABBREVIATIONS

- [List of abbreviations used]

---

CODE SUMMARY

- [Summary of building codes]

---

SHEET INDEX

- [Index of sheets]

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- [Detailed description of the project]

---

TOTAL BUILDING - FLOOR 2 3,600 GSF
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PLOTTED BY:
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GENERAL NOTES

1. SEE SHEET A-100 AND A-101 FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS AND HYDRANTS
2. SEE SHEET G-000 FOR BUILDING CODE ANALYSIS
3. SEE SHEET A-051 FOR PARKING CALCULATION REQUIREMENTS
4. SEE HORIZONTAL CONTROL PLAN FOR DIMENSIONS NOT OTHERWISE SHOWN ON DRAWINGS
5. SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR ALL PLANTING MATERIAL SPECIES, QUANTITIES AND LOCATIONS AND IRRIGATION REQUIREMENTS
6. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR ASPHALT AND CONCRETE PAVING TYPES, SECTIONS AND LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES
7. CONTROL JOINTS SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE OUTSIDE CORNERS OF BUILDINGS
8. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR ALL SITE STRIPING NOT OTHERWISE SHOWN ON DRAWINGS
9. SURFACE WATER WILL DRAIN AWAY FROM THE BUILDING. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.
10. SEE CIVIL AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS.
2. SEE SHEET G-000 FOR BUILDING CODE ANALYSIS.
3. SEE SHEET A-051 FOR PARKING CALCULATION REQUIREMENTS.
4. SEE HORIZONTAL CONTROL PLAN, CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR DIMENSIONS NOT OTHERWISE SHOWN ON DRAWINGS.
5. SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR ALL PLANTING MATERIAL SPECIES, QUANTITIES AND LOCATIONS AND IRRIGATION REQUIREMENT.
6. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR ASPHALT AND CONCRETE PAVING TYPES, SECTIONS AND LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES.
7. CONTROL JOINTS SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE OUTSIDE CORNERS OF BUILDINGS.
8. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR ALL SITE STRIPING NOT OTHERWise SHOWN ON DRAWINGS.
9. SURFACE WATER WILL DRAIN AWAY FROM THE BUILDING. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.
10. SEE CIVIL AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS.
KEYNOTES

1. Roof Pad/Curb dimensions shown above the highest point of the envelope.

2. Add 3/4" fire-resistive exterior grade plywood to face of scheduled partition at 'IT' Telecom Room, extend to 8'-0" high. Painted to match adjacent wall.

3. For symbol legend see Sheet G-000.

4. All dimensions are to face of stud, center of column/ grid line, face of CMU or UON.

5. Construct fire and/or smoke rated assemblies in their entirety prior to non-rated assemblies.

6. Grout annular spacing between piping and sleeves, where occurs.

7. Caulk/seal all connections and joints between CMU and gypsum board.

8. Elastomeric waterproof sealant at all penetrations, cut outs, caps and holes in exterior walls/envelope of building, matching colors, UON.

9. Locate door jambs 4" away from adjacent wall unless otherwise dimensioned.

GENERAL NOTES

- Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

CENTRAL PLANT FIRST FLOOR PLAN
2.9 MED/VAC/AIR 2003

EMERGENCY POWER 2002

SHOP / HOISTWAY 2001

ROOF DECK

COOLING TOWERS

1- HR SMOKE BARRIER

EXIT TO FLOOR BELOW

REQUIRED EXITS TO GRAGE

1- HR FIRE BARRIER

ACCESSIBILITY (ADOR CLEARANCE)

EQUIPMENT PAD, +6" TYP.

ROOF DRAIN SYSTEM

ROOF HATCH

WALKING PAD, NOT ON EVERY FLOOR

FLOOR SINK

FD

FLOOR DRAIN

No. C15736

Ren. 06-30-19

CONSULTANT
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DRAWN

APPROVAL

REVISIONS

AGENT NO.

ISSUE DATE

STAMP

A - 132

CENTRAL PLANT SECOND FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL ROOF PAD/CURB DIMENSION SHOWN ARE TYPICAL ABOVE THE HIGHEST POINT OF THE RIDGE.

2. ADD 3/4" FIRE RESISTIVE EXT. GRADE PLYWOOD TO FACE OF SCHEDULED PARTITION AT "IT" TELECOME ROOM, EXTEND TO 8'-0" HI. PAINTED TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL.

3. FOR SYMBOL LEGEND SEE SHEET G-000.

4. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUD, CENTER OF CMU OR UON.

5. CONSTRUCT FIRE AND/OR SMOKE RATED ASSEMBLIES IN THEIR ENTIRETY PRIOR TO NON-RATED ASSEMBLIES.

6. EXPOSED COLUMNS, BEAMS, SUPPORTS SHALL BE PAINTED PER SPECIFICATION.

7. CAULK / SEAL ALL CONNECTIONS AND JOINTS BETWEEN CMU AND GYPSUM BOARD.

8. ELASTOMERIC WATERPROOF SEALANT AT ALL PENETRATIONS, CUT OUT, CAPS AND HOLES IN EXTERIOR WALLS/ENVELOPE OF BUILDING, MATCHING COLORS. GROUT ANNULAR SPACING BETWEEN PIPING AND SLEEVES, WHERE OCCURS.

9. LOCATE DOOR JAMBS 4" AWAY FROM ADJACENT WALL UNLESS OTHERWISE DIMENSIONED.

NOTES
A. EXISTING ITEMS SCHEDULED TO REMAIN SHALL BE PROTECTED IN PLACE AND MAINTAINED BY THE CONTRACTOR. DAMAGE TO EXISTING EQUIPMENT, STRUCTURES, SYSTEMS AND SERVICES ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR AND SHALL BE RESTORED OR REPLACED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE AT THE CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE.

B. ITEMS SCHEDULED TO BE DEMOLISHED SHALL BE DISPOSED OF BY THE CONTRACTOR.

C. ITEMS SCHEDULED TO BE REMOVED SHALL BE STORED FOR REUSE OR RETURNED TO THE OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE AS DIRECTED.

D. ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR REINSTALLATION/RELOCATION SHALL BE CLEANED, REATTACHED, RECONNECTED AND RETURNED TO THEIR FULLY FUNCTIONING CONDITION.

E. UTILITIES PREVIOUSLY SERVING DEMOLISHED ITEMS SHALL BE CAPPED BEHIND ADJACENT FINISHED SURFACES UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. SEE MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL.

F. DAMAGED OR PREVIOUSLY UNFINISHED SURFACES SHALL BE RESTORED, PATCHED OR FINISHED TO MATCH ADJACENT FINISHED SURFACES.

G. SAW CUTTING AND/OR CORE DRILLING SHALL BE USED IN LIEU OF JACK HAMMERING IN ORDER TO MINIMIZE DISRUPTION TO FACILITY SERVICES AND PERSONNEL.

H. THE DEMOLITION PLAN AND NOTES ARE PRESENTED AS GENERAL INFORMATION ONLY AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT A COMPREHENSIVE ACCOUNTING OF ALL CONDITIONS PRESENT AT THE PROJECT SITE. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING THE SITE AS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FINISHED PROJECT AS DESIGNED AND DETAILED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.