ATKINS

Atkins North America, Inc.
3570 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92130

Telephone: +1.858.874.1810
Fax: +1.858.259.0741

www.atkinsglobal.com/northamerica

Memorandum

To: Ms. Corey Andrews **Date: June 30, 2015**

From: Atkins North America **Atkins Proj No: 100043888**

Subject: AAT Solana 101 Mixed Use Project – Acoustical Analysis Peer Review

Background

The proposed project is the construction of a new mixed use development. The proposed project site consists of approximately 2 acres and is located north of Dahlia Drive between Sierra Avenue and Highway 101 in Solana Beach, California. The proposed development would include a two-story commercial building occupied by commercial office, retail and restaurant space and residential buildings occupied by 31 multi-family residential units. In addition, the project site would be underlain by two levels of subterranean parking totaling 341 spaces. Vehicle access to the project site would be provided via one full movement driveway from Dahlia Drive. Existing structures on site would be demolished.

The proposed project would include 24,284 square feet (SF) of commercial retail space and 10,215 SF of commercial restaurant/retail space on the first floor. The commercial retail space proposes to accommodate a specialty supermarket. The commercial restaurant/retail space proposes to accommodate a combination of quality restaurants, restaurants with a high turnover of patrons, and retail stores. In addition, the proposed project would include three separate commercial office spaces consisting of a total of 14,137 SF on the second floor. The proposed residential component would be comprised of four separate two- and three-story buildings, each containing 4 to 10 units for a total of 31 units.

An acoustical analysis was prepared by ABC Acoustics, Inc., in 2012 to determine the potential noise impacts of the proposed development on surrounding land use. During project scoping, it was identified that the acoustical analysis did not include an assessment of impacts related to construction noise, mobile sources, or vibrational impacts from construction and operation. Therefore, Atkins' review of the acoustical analysis focuses on whether the analysis is sufficient to support CEQA analysis of on-site operational noise generated by the proposed project.

Project Site Description

The project description contains some discrepancies with the currently proposed project. The acoustical analysis describes the project as proposing 36 residential units and 54,000 square feet of office and commercial space. Additionally, the acoustical analysis states that the lot is 83,000 square feet. The current project description proposes 31 residential units and approximately 50,000 square feet of commercial and office space on an 88,689 square feet lot. Atkins has determined that these discrepancies do not affect the conclusions of the analysis.

ATKINS

Applicable Standards

The acoustical analysis states that Section 7.34.040 of the City's Noise Ordinance establishes an hourly average sound level limit of 50 dB during daytime hours and 45 dB during nighttime hours. The analysis should clarify that these standards apply to lower density residential land uses. The Noise Ordinance includes a daytime sound level limit of 55 dB for higher density residential land uses. The analysis should clarify the zoning of the surrounding residences.

The reference to Subsection C of Section 7.34.030 of the Noise Ordinance is incorrect regarding sound level limits on the boundary between two zoning districts. The reference should be to Subsection C of Section 7.34.040.

Noise Analysis Technique

The description of the ambient noise level survey should indicate the duration of the sound level measurements and the number of measurements. A map of measurement locations should be included.

Project-Related Noise Impacts

The analysis focuses on rooftop equipment and loading dock noise. Other potential noise sources should be mentioned, with a brief explanation of why these sources were eliminated from further analysis. The parking garage is mentioned in the introduction, and should be repeated in the conclusion of the analysis as well. General increase in human activity, including outdoor seating at restaurants and public gathering places, such as courtyards, should also be mentioned.

Rooftop Equipment Noise Impacts

The analysis of rooftop equipment noise impacts states that a worst-case analysis is presented that assumes five 5-ton HVAC units. The description of rooftop equipment in the first paragraph also mentions two to three 1-ton refrigeration units and a 1-ton or smaller residential HVAC unit. Table 1 provides a noise level estimate for a scenario that includes the 1-ton units, but there is no mention of these units in the text description of the worst-case scenario. The discussion should be revised to describe all modeled scenarios and identify which is the worst-case scenario. A map showing the equipment well locations should be included to substantiate the conclusion that the nearest residential units are located more than 150 feet from the proposed well locations.

Loading Dock Noise Impacts

The analysis of loading dock noise impacts should state the distance between the loading dock and the nearest receptor and provide the assumed reference noise level for project operation in order to substantiate the conclusion that noise impacts from the loading dock would not be significant. Additionally, it is not clear whether typical loading dock activities would occur with the roll up door open or closed, which would provide noise attenuation.

ATKINS

Conditions of Development and Mitigation

The analysis of loading dock impacts seems to conclude that noise from loading dock activities would be less than significant with or without the roll up door closed. However, a treatment recommendation is included for the loading dock door. It is unclear whether impacts would be significant without the roll up door with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 25 or higher, or if impacts would be significant if the loading dock door is not closed. A reference noise level and distance for project loading dock noise should be included in the analysis to clarify this impact.

Conclusion

The acoustical analysis provides enough information to prepare a CEQA analysis of noise related to rooftop equipment and parking garage noise. However, additional detail is required to clarify impacts related to loading dock noise and noise associated with activity on the project site.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please do not hesitate to call at (858) 514-1030 or email at sharon.toland@atkinsglobal.com.

Sincerely,

Sharon Toland
Environmental Analyst