VII. ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines require that EIRs include the identification and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project, while still satisfying the project objectives. The CEQA Guidelines also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> *An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose it's reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.*

Purpose

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> *Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.*

Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> *The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also*

> *identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.*

Level of Detail

The CEQA Guidelines do not require the same level of detail in the alternatives analysis as in the analysis of the proposed project. Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> *The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.*

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project applicant's objectives for the proposed condominium project are as follows:

- To create a new residential community of 37 single-family detached condominium homes without displacing existing housing.
- To help alleviate the current housing shortage by providing infill residential development on underutilized land.
- To provide housing in close proximity to commercial areas, recreation and mass transit stops.
- To provide improvements to the on- and off-site circulation system to help ensure the safety of the ingress and egress of future residents to and from the proposed project site, and for existing area residents and other motorists.
- To design a project that is consistent with the predominant character of the architecture of the neighborhood and that connects with the surrounding suburban environment and reflects neighborhood and market needs.
- To design landscape features that provide natural character and texture within the neighborhood suburban environment; that enhance the visual character of the development.

OVERVIEW OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

- Alternative 1 - No Project (No Construction)
- Alternative 2 - No Zone Change (Single-Family Residential Subdivision)
- Alternative 3 – Park Alternative

Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Consideration

In addition to specifying that the EIR evaluate "a range of reasonable alternatives" to the proposed project, Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered but were rejected as infeasible. No alternatives that were considered were subsequently rejected as infeasible.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

This section provides an analysis of the environmental impacts anticipated for each alternative in comparison to the proposed project. The analysis below focuses on the ability of the alternatives analyzed to reduce or eliminate the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. In addition, each alternative is evaluated on its ability to meet the project objectives.

Alternative 1: No Project

As required by CEQA, a No Project Alternative was analyzed. Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the project site would remain undeveloped. The analysis of the No Project Alternative assumes the continuation of existing conditions as well as development of the related projects described in Section IV (Related Projects). The potential environmental impacts associated with the No Project Alternative are described below and are compared to the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the No Project Alternative " . . . analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published . . . as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." Furthermore, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states: "If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this 'no project' consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project's non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment."

Under Alternative 1: No Project (No Construction), it is assumed that no development within the subject property would occur.

Relationship to Project Objectives

As proposed, Alternative 1 would not satisfy any of the applicant's project objectives listed above.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Under this alternative, no new construction or physical modifications would occur on the project site, and the existing vacant two-story single-family residence, sheds and aged kennel occupying the project site would remain. No oak, black walnut or non-native landscape trees would be removed from the project site. No homes would be built that might encroach into the viewshed of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. No views of the onsite oak woodland would be obstructed. No retaining walls would be constructed. No new sources of night lighting would be added.

The existing low retaining wall on San Feliciano Drive would remain as an unattractive feature of the project site, as would the aging and unsightly chain link fencing that surrounds the property. The weedy growth along San Feliciano would also remain. Furthermore, the unsightly overhead utility lines would

remain in their current location and would not be placed underground. The existing home, sheds and kennel would continue to deteriorate and the property would remain an attractive nuisance for trespassers. Lastly, the project site would remain a haven for nuisance wildlife species such as rates and possums.

In balance, under the No Project Alternative, aesthetic impacts would be less than significant compared to the proposed project's significant impacts.

Air Quality

As the site would remain unoccupied, no new air quality emission associated with demolition, grading or construction would occur. The existing buildings on-site are abandoned and unlikely to be re-occupied, therefore no vehicle trips would be generated under this Alternative and operational air quality impacts would also be less than significant. Consequently, air quality impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, no new construction or physical modifications would occur on the project site, including tree and vegetation removal and grading. Therefore, no impacts would occur to special status species that occur, or have the potential to occur, on-site. Although some special status species, specifically birds, woodrat, and reptiles, may be currently affected by human uses adjacent to the site (i.e., noise disturbance from traffic or residential activities, domestic pet predation), these impacts are considerably less under this alternative than under the proposed project. Also, under this alternative, no protected trees or sensitive plant communities would be removed or adversely impacted.

Hazards

Although the potential exists for the existing single-family home to contain asbestos containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paint, this building would not be demolished under this alternative. If for any reason in the future it were demolished, it would be subject to the same EPA and SCAQMD regulations which specify that ACMs and lead-based paint must be removed by a trained and licensed asbestos abatement and/or lead-based paint abatement contractor and disposed of as hazardous waste in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.

As no development would occur onsite, there would be no potential for the accidental rupture or damage to the crude oil pipelines in the shoulder of Mulholland Drive. Therefore, hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant and less than the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts.

Land Use

Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no request for any of the following: a change of zoning; exception from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Viewshed Protection provisions; exception

from the Specific Plan building height provisions; Zoning Administrator Determination (ZAD) and Zoning Administrator Adjustment (ZAA) to allow retaining walls at specified heights above the limits set by Ordinance No. 176445, and to allow more than the permitted number of retaining walls; or, a Protected Tree Removal/Relocation Permit to authorize the removal of nine (9) oak trees and nine (9) Southern California black walnut trees.

Neither the proposed project nor the No Project Alternative would physically divide an established community. As there would be no construction, the No Project Alternative would not be determined to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. In comparison, while the analyses indicate that the proposed project could be found to be consistent with the provisions of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, such a determination must be made by the decision-making bodies. Lastly, as there are no habitat conservation plans or community conservation plans that are applicable to the project site, neither the No Project Alternative nor the proposed project would conflict with such plans. .

While the proposed project would have less than significant Land Use impacts, the No Project Alternative would have no Land Use impacts.

Noise

Under this alternative, no demolition, grading or construction would occur on-site, therefore no short-term construction noise or vibration impacts would occur. In comparison, the proposed project would create significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impacts. For operational noise impacts, under this alternative the site would remain undeveloped and vacant. It is unlikely that the existing single-family residence on-site would be re-occupied and therefore no operational noise impacts would occur. While the operational noise impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant, there would be no noise impact from the No Project Alternative.

Traffic

As the site would remain undeveloped and the existing buildings on-site are unlikely to be re-occupied, no vehicle trips would be generated under this alternative and there would be no demand for parking. While the traffic and parking impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant, there would be no traffic and parking impacts under the No Project Alternative.

Alternative 2 - No Zone Change (Single-Family Residential Subdivision)

Under this alternative, no zone change would be sought. Rather, based upon the existing zoning of R-1 (5,000 square foot minimum lot size), the 6.19 acre project site would be subdivided into 29 single-family lots. Ten of the 29 lots abut Mulholland Drive and the remaining lots abut San Feliciano Drive or a proposed internal public cul-de-sac. Lot sizes would range from 5,000 to 21,296 square feet, and average 8,271 square feet. Lot sizes are detailed in Table VII-1, while the site plan for Alternative 2 is presented in Figure VII-1.

Four single-family housing plans would be provided: Plans A, B, C and D. Each plan would have three or four bedrooms and would have a maximum height of two stories or 33 feet. Each plan would include a two-car garage and a 20-foot driveway. There would be no basements, subterranean floors and no stepped pads. No architectural style has been selected.

Site development of Alternative 2 would require landform alteration within a grading footprint of 4.04 acres. The grading would involve approximately 30,500 cubic yards of excavation and fill emplacement. Grading would not be balanced on site; approximately 2,500 cubic yards would have to be imported to the site. There would be no public or private open space, and no common landscape areas. However, approximately 2.15 acres (or 35 percent of the site) would remain undisturbed by development activities. As with the proposed project, retaining walls would be used to limit the extent of landform alteration and disturbance of native trees.

Alternative 2 would have multiple points of access. Lots 1 through 7, 9 and 10 would take access from Mulholland Drive via a private, 20-foot wide looped driveway with two points of access on Mulholland Drive. Lots 18 through 20 would each take direct driveway access from San Feliciano Drive. Lots 8, 11 through 17 and 21 through 29 would take access from a new, 54-foot wide public cul-de-sac that would access onto San Feliciano and terminate on-site sith a cul-de-sac. The new public road would be fully improved with curbs, gutters, sidewalks and streetlights, if required.

Alternative 2 would provide 2 covered (garage) per lot.

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would implement a landscape plan designed to block views of the proposed homes as seen from Mulholland Highway (see Figure VII-2).

Figure VII-1, Alternative 2 Site Plan

Figure VII-2, Alternative 2 Landscape Plan

Table VII-1

Alternative 2 – Lot Size Summary

Lot Number	Lot Size
1	8,960 Square Feet
2	10,343 Square Feet
3	5,002 Square Feet
4	5,022 Square Feet
5	5,433 Square Feet
6	8,984 Square Feet
7	5,216 Square Feet
8	7,616 Square Feet
9	5,250 Square Feet
10	13,677 Square Feet
11	15,037 Square Feet
12	5,000 Square Feet
13	5,000 Square Feet
14	7,668 Square Feet
15	12,823 Square Feet
16	10,014 Square Feet
17	16,346 Square Feet
18	21,296 Square Feet
19	10,082 Square Feet
20	8,797 Square Feet
21	5,972 Square Feet
22	5,092 Square Feet
23	5,000 Square Feet
24	5,000 Square Feet
25	5,000 Square Feet
26	5,000 Square Feet
27	5000 Square Feet
28	5,784 Square Feet
29	10,441 Square Feet

Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would satisfy the following project objectives as listed in Section III. Project Description and reiterated above:

- To help alleviate the current housing shortage by providing infill residential development on underutilized land.
- To provide housing in close proximity to commercial areas, recreation and mass transit stops.

- To provide improvements to the on- and off-site circulation system to help ensure the safety of the ingress and egress of future residents to and from the proposed project site, and for existing area residents and other motorists.
- To design a project that is consistent with the predominant character of the architecture of the neighborhood and that connects with the surrounding suburban environment and reflects neighborhood and market needs.
- To design landscape features that provide natural character and texture within the neighborhood suburban environment; that enhance the visual character of the development.

Alternative 2 would not satisfy the following Project Objective:

- To create a new residential community of 37 single-family detached homes without displacing existing housing.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Visual Impact Analysis

As discussed in the Land Use section, below, a viewshed analysis was conducted for Alternative 2, as was done for the proposed project (see Section V.F, Land Use). As presented in Table VII-2 and depicted in Figure VII-3 (below), the potential visible impact from Mulholland Drive, is completely eliminated by intervening topography, vegetation and/or structures for the majority of residences. Units 2, 6, 8 and 10 through 28 (or 76% of all the homes) would be entirely screened from view at all points along the Mulholland right-of-way contiguous with the property. Units 3, 4 and 5 are the only residences wholly visible from Mulholland, although these units would be blocked from view at some points along Mulholland. The remaining residences (i.e., 1, 7, 9 and 29) may be partially visible from one or more points along Mulholland, but are substantially screened by intervening vegetation, topography and/or structures as indicated. With the implementation and maturity of the proposed landscape plan, none of the proposed homes would be visible from Mulholland Drive after a period of approximately five years.

Retaining Wall Impacts

Alternative 2 would also install a number of retaining walls that may be visible from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. Similar to the proposed project, the retaining walls are used to reduce the area of grading on the project site in order to preserve protected trees. In turn, the reduction in the project's grading "footprint" results in fewer impacts to protected trees on the project site. However, walls are used more extensively in Alternative 2 than in the proposed project:

- A wall is located on Lot 1 around the Fire Department turnaround. The wall is approximately 140 feet in overall length and has a maximum height of 5 feet 8 inches. Because this wall faces

away from Mulholland Drive and is below existing grade, this wall would likely not be seen from Mulholland Drive.

- A wall is located around the building pad for Lot 2. This wall is approximately 165 feet in overall length and has a maximum height of height of 3 feet. Because the wall faces away from Mulholland Dive, is located behind Lot 3, and views toward the wall are blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way, the wall would not likely be seen from Mulholland Drive.

- A wall is located on the northeast side of the building pad for Lot 6. This irregularly-shape wall winds north and west, and terminates against the Lot 8 wall. The wall has an overall length of approximately 125 feet and has a maximum height of 6.0 feet. Because the wall mostly faces away from Mulholland Dive, is located behind the building pads on Lots 5 and 6, and views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way, this wall would be minimally visible from Mulholland Drive. A wall is located on the Lot Line between Lots 7 and 9 that has an overall length of 65 feet and a maximum height of 6 feet 3 inches. Views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way; this wall would be minimally visible from Mulholland Drive.

- An irregularly-shaped wall system is located in the vicinity of Lot 8. The wall system has an overall length of approximately 335 feet and has a maximum height of height of 12 feet. This wall could be partially visible in the vicinity of the driveway leading to Lot 10, where it has a maximum height of 12 feet. The remaining portions of the wall system would range from minimally visible to not visible at all because the walls mostly face away from Mulholland Dive, are located behind building pads on Lots 5,7, and 9, and views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way.

- An irregularly-shaped wall system is located in the vicinity of Lot 10. It has an overall length of 190 feet with a maximum height of 12 feet. Views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way.

- An irregularly-shaped wall system surrounds Building Pad 15 on three sides. It has an overall length of approximately 229 feet with a maximum height of 8 feet. Approximately 52.5 feet of this wall is shared in common with Lot 6 and an additional 22.5 feet are shared in common with Lot 8. This wall system would not be visible from Mulholland Drive since Building Pad 15 (elevation 1,015) steps down 11 feet from the elevation of the intervening Building Pad 6 (elevation 1,026).

- An irregularly-shaped wall system is located in the vicinity of Lot 10. It has an overall length of 190 feet with a maximum height of 12 feet. Views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way. It is unlikely this wall would be visible from Mulholland Drive

since it closest approach to the centerline of that roadway would be approximately 345 feet and there would be several houses and numerous intervening trees to block the view.

- An irregularly-shaped wall system is located on the northeast and northwest sides of Building Pad 17. It has an overall length of 131 feet with a maximum height of 10.5 feet. Views toward the wall are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way. It is unlikely this wall would be visible from Mulholland Drive since it closest approach to the centerline of that roadway would be approximately 380 feet and there would be several houses and numerous intervening trees to block the view.

- Another irregularly-shaped wall system is located on Lot 29. This wall system has an overall length of approximately 50 feet and has a maximum height of height of 3 feet. The wall system would be screened from view by the dense tree canopy in the right-of-way.

- The last wall system begins between Lots 11 to 13. This wall system has an overall length of approximately 395 feet and has a maximum height of 12 feet. The wall runs south along the northeasterly Lot Line between Lots 13 and 8, then southwesterly through Lots 13, 12, and 11, then northwesterly 55 feet on the vicinity of Lot 11, then angles toward proposed "A" Street, then along the right-of-way of the proposed "A" Street until it terminates at the cul-de-sac. This wall system would not be visible from Mulholland Drive because it mostly faces away from Mulholland Drive and views toward the wall system are largely blocked by dense tree canopy in the right-of-way,

In addition to the above, there are various other walls on the site. However, due to such factors as orientation, size and intervening terrain, housing and vegetation, these walls are not expected to be visible from Mulholland Drive. The proposed project would build approximately 1,272 linear feet of retaining walls on the project site. In comparison, Alternative 2 would build in excess of 2,000 linear feet of retaining walls, or more than 700 linear feet more than the proposed project. The retaining walls for both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would be minimally visible due to the screening effect provided by the intervening dense tree canopy, a topographic knoll and the future homes; also, most portions of the walls would face away from Mulholland. However, the retaining walls would be somewhat more visible under Alternative 2 when compared to the proposed project. This, combined with the greater linear length of retaining walls under Alternative 2, suggests that Alternative 2 would have a somewhat greater aesthetic impact, with respect to retaining walls, that the proposed project; although retaining wall impacts would be less than significant for both the proposed project and Alternative 2.

Impacts to Protected Trees

Alternative 2 would require the removal of approximately 41 trees, including 11 (#54 dead) oak trees, and in comparison, the proposed project would require the removal of approximately 37 trees, including 9 oak trees. Both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would remove 9 of the 11 Southern California Black

Walnut trees present, preserving 2 on the project site. However, Alternative 2 would remove a total eleven oak trees, which is three two oak trees more than the proposed project. While the oak trees removed by the proposed project are mostly screened by the intervening trees along the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, Alternative 2 would remove Oak Tree No. 114, which is visible from San Feliciano Drive. Because these oak trees are not prominently visible from the scenic parkway, both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would have less-than-significant aesthetic impacts to oak trees. However, because Alternative 2 would remove three two more oak trees than the proposed project, and because the removal of tree No. 114 would be visible from San Feliciano Drive, aesthetic tree impacts under Alternative 2 would be slightly greater than the proposed project.

The trees impacted by Alternative 2 are listed in Table VII-2. Figure VII-3, Alternative 2 Tree Impact Map, shows the locations of all the trees listed in Table VII-2, as well as all the trees to be removed/retained. Table VII-3 provides a comparative summary for the impacted trees.

A review of Figure VII-3 demonstrates that most of the oaks and the other trees that would be removed under Alternative 2 are located within the interior of the project site and are not readily visible from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. For the most part, the oak trees are situated behind groves of existing trees and/or behind intervening knolls. Additionally, five of the eleven oak trees to be removed have an aesthetic rating of "D" (poor), one oak #54 is dead while only three are rated as "B" (good). While the oak woodland on the project site has high aesthetic values, the individual oak trees slated for removal are not readily seen and therefore have not acquired a distinctive significance with reference to the other trees or monuments on the project site. The one possible exception is Oak Tree No. 114, which is visible from San Feliciano Drive, although not from Mulholland Drive.

Figure VII-3, Alternative 2 Tree Impact Map

Table VII-2
Alternative 2 Tree Removals

Tree ID	Common Name	Removed by Alt. 2	Removed by Project	Aesthetic Rating
39	Coast Live Oak	X		D
40	Apple	X	X	C
41	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	B
42	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
43	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
44	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
45	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
46	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
47	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	C
48	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	B
49	Mexican Fan Palm	X	X	B
53	Coast Live Oak	X	X	D (lying down)
54	Coast Live Oak	X	X	F
57	King Palm	X	X	B
58	Coast Live Oak	X	X	D
59	Fig	X	X	C
60	Coast Live Oak	X	X	D
61	Coast Live Oak	X	X	D
62	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X	X	D
65	California Pepper	X		D
66	California Pepper	X		C
79	English Walnut	X	X	C
89	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X	X	C
90	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X	X	D
91	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X	X	B
92	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
93	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
94	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
95	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
96	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
97	Mexican Elderberry	X	X	D
109	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X	X	B
110	Coast Live Oak	X	X	B
111	Coast Live Oak	X	X	B
114	Coast Live Oak	X		B
187	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X		C
188	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X		C
189	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X		C
190	So. Calif. Black Walnut	X		C
191	Coast Live Oak	X	X	C
193	Coast Live Oak	X		C

A. Excellent – This tree is a healthy and vigorous tree characteristic of its species and free of any visible signs of disease or pest infestation

B. Good – This tree is healthy and vigorous. There are minor visible signs of disease and pest infestation

C Fair – This tree is healthy in overall appearance, but there is a normal amount of disease and/or pest infestation

D. Poor – This tree is characterized by exhibiting a greater degree of disease and/or pest infestation or structural

instability than normal and appears to be in a state of decline
E. Very Poor – This tree exhibits extensive signs of dieback
F. Dead – This tree exhibits no signs of life at the time of field evaluation

Table VII-3
Alternative 2 Tree Removal Comparison Summary

Tree – Common Name	Alternative 2	Proposed Project
Coast Live Oak	11	9
Apple	1	1
Mexican Fan Palm	9	9
King Palm	1	1
Fig	1	1
California Pepper	2	0
English Walnut	1	1
So. Calif. Black Walnut	9	9
Mexican Elderberry	6	6
Total Trees Removed	41	37

Night Lighting

Both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would convert the primarily dark site to an illuminated residential setting. There would be eight fewer homes under Alternative 2, therefore Alternative 2 can be expected to create less window glare from the homes and less landscape/security lighting than the proposed project. Also, because there would be less vehicular traffic generated by Alternative 2, there would be less vehicle headlights than under the proposed project.

Under the proposed project there would be 3.3 acres of open space that would not be illuminated, but there would be no such open space under Alternative 2. Rather, all 6.19 acres of the project site would be subdivided into private lots. As private property, individual homeowners could choose to expand the area of illumination around their homes. Consequently, it is possible that Alternative 2 could produce more exterior landscape lighting, even though there would be few homes.

Under the proposed project, street lighting would be limited to low intensity carriage lights mounted on the exterior walls of the homes. In contrast, Alternative 2 would provide a fully improved internal outletting on San Feliciano Drive. Full street improvements typically include standard overhead street lights. Therefore, Alternative 2 could be expected to produce more street lighting than the proposed project. Because the project site is located along a stretch of Mulholland Drive that is already illuminated by street lighting, and because there are numerous other sources of lighting in the immediate area, including the brightly illuminated intersection of Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway and the Gelsons Village Calabasas shopping center, night lighting impacts under both Alternative 2 and the

proposed project would be less than significant, although impacts would be somewhat greater under Alternative 2.

With respect to existing visual character or quality of the project site, both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would remove a number of protected trees and would place housing in an oak woodland. Hence both would affect the existing visual character or quality of the project site; but, both would implement mitigation measures, which would reduce the aesthetic impact of the developments to a less-than-significant levels. However, because there would be fewer homes under Alternative 2 and the homes would be three feet shorter than the proposed homes, Alternative 2 would further reduce the aesthetic impact of the proposed project.

Air Quality

Under this alternative, there would be approximately 30,500 cubic yards (cy) of cut and fill on site, as opposed to 21,400 cy of cut and fill under the proposed project. Thus, grading-related air quality impacts from equipment emissions and dust generation would be proportionally increased - approximately 43 percent more under Alternative 2 than under the proposed project. However, Alternative 2 would construct 29 homes of approximately the same size as the 37 homes to be constructed under the proposed project. Hence, grading-related emissions would be greater while, non-grading related construction emissions from equipment and from architectural coatings would be proportionally reduced – by approximately 22 percent. Operational air quality impacts (primarily vehicle emissions) would also be approximately 22 percent less since, with eight fewer homes, Alternative 2 would be expected to generate approximately 22 percent fewer daily vehicle miles traveled. Overall, construction-related air quality impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be comparable to those associated with the proposed project, while operation-related emissions would be of a lower magnitude than the project's less than significant impacts.

Biological Resources

Alternative 2 would result in less undisturbed open space (2.15 acres as opposed to 2.37 under the proposed project), and would not result in any additional open space areas (where as the proposed project would result in an additional 0.93-acre of private open space). Alternative 2 would remove nine Southern California black walnut trees (special status plants), which is the same number of walnuts that would be removed by the proposed project. Alternative 2 would also increase impacts to coast live oak trees (special status plants), as it would remove 11 oak trees while the proposed project would remove nine (9) trees. Altogether, Alternative 2 would remove a total of 41 trees (including 20 protected; in comparison, the proposed project would remove a total of 37 trees, including 18 protected trees. This alternative would result in very similar impacts to other special status species present or potentially present on-site, including vegetation removal and grading impacts, noise and other construction disturbance, and post-construction operational disturbances. Alternative 2 may result in slightly less adverse impacts to special status reptiles from vehicle strikes and human and domestic pet disturbance due to the reduced length of

the internal access road and the fewer number of residences. Due to the access road and the building and lot locations along San Feliciano Drive under Alternative 2, impacts to the sensitive purple needlegrass plant community would be increased as there would be less area remaining following grading for habitat replacement through seeding and/or planting.

Overall, Alternative 2 would result in relatively equivalent impacts to biological resources, as none of the impacts would vary considerably in magnitude or extent as compared to the proposed project; while some impacts would be potentially greater in magnitude (less open space, more potential impact to certain special status species [woodrat], more impact to sensitive plant communities), other impacts would be potentially lower in magnitude (less potential impact to certain special status species [reptiles, walnut], fewer trees removed), and other impacts would be virtually identical (birds).

Hazards

Both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would require the demolition of the existing onsite structures. Thus, the proposed project and Alternative 2 have the same potential to release ACMs and/or lead-based paint into the environment during demolition. However, these demolition activities would be subject to the same EPA and SCAQMD rules and regulations to ensure safe and proper removal and disposal of these materials. With adherence to these regulations, no significant impacts would result from ACM or lead-based paint removal for either the Alternative 2 or proposed project.

As previously discussed, there are two crude oil pipelines located within the Mulholland Drive right-of-way adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would construct one 28-foot wide roadway within the right-of-way. In contrast, Alternative 2 would construct one fully improved 54-foot wide roadway, a 28-foot wide driveway and a 20-foot driveway within the right-of-way. Thus, Alternative 2 has a greater potential for accidental rupture of the pipelines than has the proposed project. Nevertheless, both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would be subject to the same standard operating procedures for construction in the vicinity of known pipelines, generally consisting of notification and marking requirements. Compliance with these standard procedures would reduce the potential for the accidental release of crude oil into environment to a less-than-significant levels for both the proposed project and Alternative 2. However, because Alternative 2 would conduct more grading within the right-of-way, it would have a greater potential for impact than the proposed project.

Land Use

As previously discussed, the proposed project site is bounded on the north and west by single-family homes. To the east is the Girard Reservoir. To the south is Mulholland Drive. The project site is fenced and there is no public access through it between Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive. Consequently, the development of the site under either the proposed project or Alternative 2 would not place a barrier between existing land uses or prevent free movement along existing north-south or east-

west corridors. Therefore, neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 would physically divide an established community; neither project would have an impact in this respect.

There are no habitat conservation plans or community conservation plans that are applicable to the project site. Therefore, neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 would conflict with any habitat conservation plan or community conservation plan; neither project would have an impact in this respect.

Local and Regional Plans

According to SCAG, the proposed project is not regionally significant. Because Alternative 2 would provide fewer homes, it would not be regionally significant, either. As discussed in Section V.C (Air Quality) the proposed project is consistent with the AQMP housing forecasts for Los Angeles County, and would not jeopardize attainment of State and federal ambient air quality standards in the Basin. Because Alternative 2 would provide fewer homes, it would not be regionally significant, either. As discussed in Section V.H (Traffic/Transportation/Parking) of this Draft EIR, the local CMP requires that all CMP intersections be analyzed where a project would likely add 50 or more trips during the peak hours. The proposed project would not add 50 or more trips to the Topanga Canyon Boulevard at Ventura Boulevard CMP intersection. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant CMP impact. Because Alternative 2 would provide fewer homes, it would further reduce the less than significant impact to CMP intersections.

City of Los Angeles General Plan - Community Plan

The 6.19-acre proposed project site is designated Low Residential by the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan Area. The Low Residential designation allows residential densities of up to nine (9) dwelling units per net acre. Based on density allowed under the land use designation, the maximum number of single-family units that could be developed on the site would be approximately 54 units. As Alternative 2 consists of 29 homes, it would be consistent with the Community Plan land use designation. Table VII-4, provides a comparison of the proposed project and Alternative 2 with respect to the Community Plan Goals and Polices. Based upon that analysis, it is concluded that Alternative 2 can be found to be consistent with the applicable policies of the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan.

Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

The analysis of Alternative 2 compatibility with the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan is provided in Table VII-5. Alternative 2 would not require the same discretionary approvals from the City of Los Angeles as the proposed project. With approval of the discretionary actions, Alternative 2 could be found not to conflict with the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. Those discretionary actions include:

- Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505 – to authorize a 29 lot single family residential subdivision.

- Specific Plan Exception, Viewshed – Would grant permission to encroach into the scenic parkway "viewshed" with a limited number of the residences.

- Zoning Administrator Adjustment (ZAA) – To allow retaining walls at specified heights eight feet or less within the required yards.

- Protected Tree Removal/Relocation Permit - to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees, nine (9) Southern California black walnuts, 6 (six) other native and 15 non-native trees.

Table VII-4
Proposed Project/Alternative Community Plan Objectives and Policies Comparison

No.	Objective/Policy	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Objective 1-1 Achieve and maintain a housing supply sufficient to meet the diverse economic needs of current and project population to the year 2010			
1-1.1	Maintain an adequate supply and distribution of multi-family housing opportunities in the Community Plan Area.	Although the proposed type of ownership is condominium, the proposed homes are single-family, detached houses. No multi-family housing is proposed.	Alternative 2 would provide 29 single-family homes. No multiple-family homes would be provided.
1-1.2	Protect existing single family residential neighborhoods from new, out-of-scale development.	The Community Plan permits single-family residential development at densities ranging between 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre, with a mid-range of 6.5 units per acre. The project proposes single-family homes at a density of 6 units per acre.	The Community Plan permits single-family residential development at densities ranging between 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre, with a mid-range of 6.5 units per acre. Alternative 2 proposes single-family homes at a density of 4.7 units per acre.
1-1.3	Protect existing stable single-family and low density residential neighborhoods from being impacts by the size of commercial development.	No commercial development is proposed.	No commercial development is proposed.
1-1.4	Protect the quality of the residential environment through attention to the physical appearance of communities.	The proposed project would be subject to the Design Review procedures and guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.	Alternative 2 would be subject to the Design Review procedures and guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.
1-1.5	Protect existing stable single-family and low density residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.	The density allowed in the proposed RD6 zone, at 6,000 square feet per dwelling unity, falls within the density range of 4,840 to 10,890 square feet per dwelling unit allowed by the Community Plan. Therefore, the project is not an encroachment by a higher density residential use.	The density allowed in the existing R1 zone, at a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, is approximately 53 homes. Alternative 2 would provide 29 homes on lots that average approximately 8,271 square feet. Therefore, Alternative 2 is not an encroachment by a higher density residential use.
1-1.6	Promote neighborhood preservation, particularly in existing single-family neighborhoods, as well as in areas with existing multi-family residences.	With the exception of one abandoned single-family house, the project site is vacant. Therefore, the project will not remove any current housing in the neighborhood. Furthermore, the project is a single-family residential development at a compatible density with the surrounding single-family neighborhood.	Alternative 2 would not remove any current housing in the neighborhood. Furthermore, Alternative 2 is a single-family residential development at a compatible density with the surrounding single-family neighborhood. It therefore promotes neighborhood preservation.

Table VII-4
Proposed Project/Alternative Community Plan Objectives and Policies Comparison

No.	Objective/Policy	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Objective 1-2	**Reduce automobile trips in residential areas by locating new housing in areas offering proximity to goods, services and facilities.**		
1-2.1	Locate higher residential densities near commercial centers and major bus routes where public service facilities, utilities and topography will accommodate this development.	The project is a low density development. Therefore, this policy is not applicable. However, the project site is located in close proximity to the Gelson's Village Calabasas shopping center and the adjacent Mulholland Drive is served by MTA bus line 245, with a bus stop at the corner of Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway. Utilities are available at the project site and do not require major extensions.	Alternative 2 is a low density development. Therefore, this policy is not applicable. However, the project site is located in close proximity to the Gelson's Village Calabasas shopping center and the adjacent Mulholland Drive is served by MTA bus line 245, with a bus stop at the corner of Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway. Utilities are available at the project site and do not require major extensions.
1-2.2	Encourage multiple residential development in commercial zones.	The project is not a multiple residential development and the project site is not in a commercial zone. Therefore, this policy is not applicable.	Alternative 2 is not a multiple residential development and the project site is not in a commercial zone. Therefore, this policy is not applicable.
Objective 1-3	**Preserve and enhance the character and integrity of existing single-family and multi-family neighborhoods.**		
1-3.1	Seek a high degree of compatibility and landscaping for new infill development to protect the character and scale of existing residential neighborhoods.	The density allowed in the proposed RD6 zone, at 6,000 square feet per dwelling unity, falls within the density range of 4,840 to 10,890 square feet per dwelling unit allowed by the Community Plan. Therefore, with respect to density the project is compatible with the existing residential neighborhood. Also, the proposed project would be subject to the Design Review procedures and landscaping guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.	The density allowed in the existing R1 zone, at a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, is approximately 54 homes. Alternative 2 would provide 29 homes on lots that average approximately 8,271 square feet. Therefore, Alternative 2 is compatible with respect to density. Also, Alternative 2 would be subject to the Design Review procedures and landscaping guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.
1-3.2	Approval of proposals to change residential density in any neighborhood shall be based, in part, on consideration of factors such as neighborhood character and identity, compatibility of land uses, impact on livability,	The proposed change in land use density does not result in a change in residential density.	Alternative 2 does not require a request to change the permitted residential density on the project site.

Table VII-4
Proposed Project/Alternative Community Plan Objectives and Policies Comparison

No.	Objective/Policy	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
	adequacy of services and public facilities, and traffic impacts.		
1-3.3	Preserve existing views in hillside areas.	The proposed project would obstruct existing views of the onsite oak woodland in a hillside area (see Section V.B, Aesthetics).	Alternative 2 would obstruct existing views of the onsite oak woodland in a hillside area (see Section V.B, Aesthetics).
Objective 1-4	**Provide a diversity of housing opportunities capable of accommodating all persons regardless of income, age or ethnic background.**		
1-4.1	Promote greater individual choice in type, quality, price and location.	The proposed project would provide 37 high-end single-family detached condominium units. These units offer single-family ownership with common grounds maintenance.	Alternative 2 would provide 29 single family homes which would be compatible in density with the surrounding neighborhood.
1-4.2	Promote mixed use housing projects in pedestrian oriented areas.	The project is not a mixed use. The project site is not pedestrian oriented.	Alternative 2 is not a mixed use. The project site is not pedestrian oriented.
1-4.3	Ensure new housing opportunities minimize displacement of the residents.	The project site is vacant, with the exception of one abandoned single-family homes. No residents would be displaced by the project development.	The project site is vacant, with the exception of one abandoned single-family homes. No residents would be displaced by the project development.
1-4.4	Increase home ownership options by providing opportunities for development of townhouses, condominiums and similar types of housing.	The project increases home ownership opportunities by its development of single-family detached condominiums.	Alternative 2 increases home ownership opportunities by its development of 29 new single-family homes.
Objective 1-5	**To limit the intensity and density of residential development in hillside areas.**		
1-5.1	Limit development according to the adequacy of the existing and assured street circulation system within the Plan Area and surrounding areas.	The existing conditions at the study intersections indicate that all of the analyzed locations are operating at acceptable LOS ranging from LOS A to C, with the exception of Dumetz Road/Topanga Canyon Boulevard which operates at LOS D during the PM peak hour (see Section V.H, Traffic).	The existing conditions at the study intersections indicate that all of the analyzed locations are operating at acceptable LOS ranging from LOS A to C, with the exception of Dumetz Road/Topanga Canyon Boulevard which operates at LOS D during the PM peak hour (see Section V.H, Traffic).
1-5.2	Ensure the availability of adequate sewers, drainage facilities, fire	All utility and public services are considered to be adequate to serve the proposed project without adversely	Because Alternative 2 would developed 8 fewer homes than the proposed project, all utility and

Table VII-4
Proposed Project/Alternative Community Plan Objectives and Policies Comparison

No.	Objective/Policy	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
	protection services and other public utilities to support development within hillside areas.	affecting the surrounding neighborhoods (see Section V.A, Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant).	public services would be adequate to serve the development without adversely affecting the surrounding neighborhoods (see Section V.A, Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant).
1-5.3	Consider the steepness of the topography and suitability of the geology in any proposal for development within the Plan area.	Steepness of topography has been taken into consideration during site planning: 65.6% of the project site has slope gradients of 10% or less; 6.9% of the site has slope gradients between 10 and 15%; and 27.5% of the site has slope gradients over 15%. Site development has been located on the gentler slopes to the extent feasible. There are no substantial geologic constraints on the project site (see Section V.A, Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant).	Steepness of topography has been taken into consideration during site planning: 65.6% of the project site has slope gradients of 10% or less; 6.9% of the site has slope gradients between 10 and 15%; and 27.5% of the site has slope gradients over 15%. Site development has been located on the gentler slopes to the extent feasible. There are no substantial geologic constraints on the project site (see Section V.A, Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant).
1-5.4	Require that any proposed development be designed to enhance and be compatible with adjacent development.	The proposed project would be subject to the Design Review procedures and landscape guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. This will ensure compatibility with adjacent development.	Alternative 2 would be subject to the Design Review procedures and landscape guidelines established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. This would ensure compatibility with adjacent homes.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Section 5: INNER CORRIDOR REGULATIONS		
A. Uses **1. Permitted Uses.** All projects visible from Mulholland Drive and located within the inner corridor shall conform to the following regulations: The following uses shall be permitted subject to the limitations established by the Specific Plan:		
a. One-family dwellings and related parking and accessory buildings	The proposed project is the development of 37 detached single-family homes. Each home would provide two covered parking spaces in garages per current Municipal Code regulations. In addition, 19 on-site visitor parking spaces would be provided.	Alternative 2 is the development of 29 detached single-family homes. Each home would provide two covered parking spaces in garages per current Municipal Code regulations. On-street parking would be provided for visitors.
b. Fences, gates, and walls	In order to reduce the size of the grading footprint, the proposed project would utilize retaining walls. Refer to section V.B., Aesthetics, *Retaining Wall Impacts* for a full discussion. Whether the project site would be gated has not been determined.	In order to reduce the size of the grading footprint, Alternative 2 would also utilize retaining walls. Refer to the discussion of Aesthetics in this section for a full discussion of retaining wall impacts. The project site would not be gated.
c. Driveways	The proposed project would provide a private access road from Mulholland Drive, through to San Feliciano Drive. Each home within the development would be provided with driveway access off of this private drive.	Alternative 2 would provide a public access cul-de-sac from San Feliciano Drive. Seventeen homes within the development would be provided with driveway access off of this private drive. In addition, there would be two driveways with direct access to Mulholland Drive and three driveways with direct access to San Feliciano drive.
d. Night lighting on private property, provided it is low-height, low-illumination safety lighting of a color similar to incandescent light which is shielded and directed onto the property	The project proposes not to install standard street lighting on the private drive between Mulholland Highway and San Feliciano Drive. Rather, the project would seek to use low intensity lighting to minimize potential glare and night sky illumination. Also, see Mitigation Measures B-17 through B-20 for further proposed lighting restrictions.	If required, Alternative 2 would provide standard pole mounted street lights. Other than street lights, Alternative 2 would provide the same lighting mitigation as the proposed project.
e. Landscape materials and associated irrigation equipment	A total area of 37,500 sf (13.9% of the project site) would be covered with landscaping. Landscaping would consist of approximately 3,500 sf of common area and 34,000 sf of	Landscaping would be provided by the individual homeowners.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
	private landscaping in association with the proposed homes. In addition there would be 103,135 sf (38.27% of the project site) of undisturbed open space and 40,626 sf (17.7% of the project site) of private open space. Landscaping in association with the homes and common areas would adhere to the requirements of the Specific Plan. A homeowners association would be responsible for the maintenance of the common landscape areas and open space.	
f. Core trails	No trails are planned for the proposed project.	Alternative 2 does not include trails.
g. Major vista points	No major vista points are planned for the proposed project.	Alternative 2 does not include vista points.
B. Environmental Protection Measures **1. Prominent Ridges.**		
a. Grading on Prominent Ridges. Notwithstanding Subsection C below, prominent ridges shall not be graded, altered or removed without the prior written approval of the Director pursuant to Section 11. The Director may approve up to 1,000 cubic yards of grading of a prominent ridge after making the following findings:	There are no prominent ridges, as defined by the Specific Plan, located on the project site. The proposed project will not affect any prominent ridge.	There are no prominent ridges, as defined by the Specific Plan, located on the project site. Alternative 2 would not affect any prominent ridge.
2. Streams.		
No project shall be constructed and no more than 100 cubic yards of earth shall be moved within 100 feet of either stream bank without the prior written approval of the Director pursuant to Section 11.	According to the Canoga Park, California 7.5 Minute Series U.S.G.S. Topographic Quadrangle (1967), an intermittent blue-line stream flows through the central portion of the project site. However, this map has not been revised in the last 40 years. Since the last map revision, the onsite portion of the stream has been enclosed in an underground culvert that flows directly	According to the Canoga Park, California 7.5 Minute Series U.S.G.S. Topographic Quadrangle (1967), an intermittent blue-line stream flows through the central portion of the project site. However, this map has not been revised in the last 40 years. Since the last map revision, the onsite portion of the stream has been

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
	into the storm drain in San Feliciano Drive. Therefore, the project would not grade more than 100 cubic yards of earth within 100 feet of a stream bank.	enclosed in an underground culvert that flows directly into the storm drain in San Feliciano Drive. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not grade more than 100 cubic yards of earth within 100 feet of a stream bank.
3. Projects Near Parklands.		
No Project shall be erected and no earth shall be graded within 200 feet of the boundaries of any public parkland without the prior written approval of the Director pursuant to Section 11. The Director may approve the construction of a project or grading within 200 feet of public parkland after making the following findings:	The nearest public parkland is the City of Los Angeles Alizondo Drive Park, located approximately 900 feet to the northeast of the project site. According to the Department of Recreation and Parks, this park is non-developed and used for brush clearance once a year. The park is unstaffed, unlocked and open from dawn to dusk. The proposed project's development area would not be within 200 feet of the boundaries of this park.	The nearest public parkland is the City of Los Angeles Alizondo Drive Park, located approximately 900 feet to the northeast of the project site. According to the Department of Recreation and Parks, this park is non-developed and used for brush clearance once a year. The park is unstaffed, unlocked and open from dawn to dusk. Therefore, the development area of Alternative 2 would not be within 200 feet of the boundaries of this park.
4. Oak Trees		
No oak tree (Quercus agrifolia, Q. lobata, or Q. virginiana) shall be removed, cut down or moved without the prior written approval of the Director. The Director may approve the removal, cutting down or moving of an oak tree after making the following findings:	The proposed project would remove six (6) Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak) trees to make way for the project's access road. Therefore, the project applicant would seek an Oak Tree Removal Permit.	Alternative 2 would remove eleven (11) Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak) trees to make way for development. Therefore, Alternative 2 would require approval of an Oak Tree Removal Permit.
a. The removal, cutting down or moving of an oak tree will not result in an undesirable, irreversible soil erosion through diversion or increased flow of surface waters.	According to the preliminary hydrology investigation, the existing unimproved project site drains into the abandoned Girard Reservoir and from there into an existing storm drain in San Feliciano Drive. Currently, during a 50-year storm event, the project site would produce a peak flow of 25.7 cubic feet per second (cfs). After project development, the developed site would produce a peak runoff of 30.9 cfs from an equivalent	Site runoff under Alternative 2 would be approximately the same as the runoff from the proposed project. The runoff would be conveyed to the storm drain in San Feliciano Drive via non-erosive drainage improvements and paved streets. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less potential for soil erosion from uncontrolled runoff. Furthermore, the oak trees would only be

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
	storm. However, while site runoff would increase by 5.2 cfs, the increased runoff would be conveyed to the storm drain in San Feliciano Drive via non-erosive drainage improvements and paved streets. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less potential for soil erosion from uncontrolled runoff. Furthermore, the oak trees would only be removed to accommodate development. Site preparation in the vicinity of the removed oak trees would include soil stabilization in the form of building construction, pavement or landscaping. Consequently, the removal of the oak trees would not be expected to result in an undesirable, irreversible soil erosion through diversion or increased flow of surface waters.	removed to accommodate development. Site preparation in the vicinity of the removed oak trees would include soil stabilization in the form of building construction, pavement or landscaping. Consequently, the removal of the oak trees would not be expected to result in an undesirable, irreversible soil erosion through diversion or increased flow of surface waters.
b. The oak tree is not located with reference to other trees or monuments in such a way as to acquire a distinctive significance at said location.	There are no National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest, or City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments on the project site, therefore none of the existing oak trees on the project site are associated with a monument or have any distinctive historic significance. All six oak trees proposed for removal are located within the interior of the project site and are not readily visible from offsite locations. For the most part, the oak trees are situated behind groves of existing trees and/or behind intervening knolls. Additionally, four of the six oak trees to be removed have an aesthetic rating of "D" (poor), while only two are rated as "B" (good). Therefore, the individual oak trees slated for removal have not acquired a distinctive significance with reference to the other trees or monuments on the project site.	Because there are no National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest, or City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments on the project site, none of the existing oak trees on the project site are associated with a monument or have any distinctive historic significance. Ten of the eleven oak trees that would be removed by Alternative 2 for removal are located within the interior of the project site and are not readily visible from offsite locations. For the most part, the oak trees are situated behind groves of existing trees and/or behind intervening knolls. One tree (No. 114) is visible from San Feliciano Drive. Additionally, five of the eleven oak trees to be removed have an aesthetic rating of "D" (poor) and one (#54) is dead, while only three are rated as "B" (good). Therefore, the individual oak trees slated for removal have not acquired a distinctive significance with reference to the other trees or monuments on the project site.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
5. Archaeological and Paleontological Resources		
Applicants which propose to grade more than 50 cubic yards per 5,000 square feet of lot area shall submit to the Director a preliminary archaeological and paleontological record search from the State Regional Archaeological Information Centre (UCLA). If this search reveals that the archaeological and paleontological resources may be located on the lot, the applicant shall file an environmental assessment with the Planning Department.	The proposed project would grade an estimated 21,400 cubic yards (10,700 cubic yards of cut and 10,700 cubic yards fill) over an area of 269,856.8 sf. Therefore a Phase I Archaeological Survey prepared by W & S Consultants, November 30, 2004, and a South Central Coastal Information Center Records Search dated July 22, 2004 were compiled for the proposed project site. These reports indicate no evidence of archaeological resources on the project site. However, to insure that impacts to archaeological resources remain less than significant, several Conditions of Approval, which may be required by the City of Los Angeles are listed in the proposed project's Initial Study (refer to Appendix A, Section IV. Environmental Analysis). A Paleontologic Resources Evaluation Report, prepared by Paleontologic Resources Management, was also prepared. No direct evidence of paleontologic resources were identified on the project site. However, to insure that impacts to paleontologic resources remain less than significant, several Conditions of Approval, which may be required by the City of Los Angeles are listed in the proposed project's Initial Study (refer to Appendix A, Section IV. Environmental Analysis).	Alternative 2 would grade an estimated 30,500 cubic (14,000 cubic yards of cut and 16,500 cubic yards fill) yards of soil over a 269,856.8 sf area. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have greater grading impact than the proposed project. However, to insure that impacts to archaeological resources remain less than significant, the same Conditions of Approval would be applicable for Alternative 2. To insure that impacts to paleontologic resources remain less than significant, the same Conditions of Approval would be applicable for Alternative 2.
5.C. Grading **1. Grading**		
No grading in excess of one cubic yard of earth per four square feet of lot area per lot visible from Mulholland Drive shall be permitted without the prior written approval of the Director pursuant to Section 11. However, corrective grading as determined by the Department of	The proposed project would grade an estimated 21,400 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill soil over the 269,856.8 sf project area. The Specific Plan regulations would permit 67,396 cubic yards of grading 269,857 ÷ 4 = 67,396. Therefore the proposed project is within the limits of the Specific Plan's grading allowance and does not require the Director's approval of up to two cubic yards per square foot	Alternative 2 would grade an estimated 30,500 cubic yards of cut and fill soil over the 269,856.8 sf project area. The Specific Plan regulations would permit 67,396 cubic yards of grading 269,857 ÷ 4 = 67,396. Therefore Alternative 2 is within the limits of the Specific Plan's grading allowance and does not require the Director's approval of up to two cubic yards per square foot

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Building and Safety is not to be included in this calculation. The Director may approve grading up to two cubic yards of earth per four square feet of lot area per lot.		
2. All graded slopes shall comply with the provisions in Section 10 (Landscaping) of this Specific Plan.	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval. A conceptual landscape plan is included in the Section III, Project Description as Figure III-5.	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.
5.D. Building Standards **1. Viewshed Protection.**		
No building or structure visible from Mulholland Drive on an upslope or downslope lot shall penetrate the viewshed without the prior written approval of the Director pursuant to Section 11. For purposes of this Subsection, the measurement of height shall be as defined in Section 12.03 of the Code and shall be measured from existing natural or finished grade, whichever is lower. The Director may approve a project's penetration into the viewshed after making the following findings:	A viewshed analysis (Refer to Section V.B. Aesthetics) has determined that due to intervening topography, vegetation and/or structures, two of the proposed project's 37 homes would be wholly visible from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, and 11 homes would be partially visible. The Project Applicant is seeking a Specific Plan Exception to allow encroachment into the protected viewshed of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway.	A viewshed analysis for Alternative 2 (see discussion, above) has determined that due to intervening topography, vegetation and/or structures, 3 of the 29 homes would be wholly visible from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, and 4 homes would be partially visible. The Project Applicant would need a Specific Plan Exception to allow encroachment into the protected viewshed of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway.
a. The Department of Building and Safety has determined that the height of the project does not exceed	The Applicant requests permission to exceed those height limits set for buildings on Upslope property within 500 feet of the Mulholland Drive right-of-way (the "ROW"). Section 5 D 2	Alternative 2 would require a Specific Plan Exception, Viewshed to grant permission to encroach into the scenic parkway "viewshed" with a limited number of the

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
the height limit allowed in paragraphs a, b or c of subdivision 2.	of the Specific Plan requires that buildings on upslope lots be limited to 15 feet within 100 feet of the ROW and limited to 30 feet between 100 feet and 500 feet of the ROW. A Specific Plan Exception related to building height will be needed for those pads which could be defined as upslope.	residences.
b. The project is designed to complement the view from Mulholland Drive.	The proposed project would develop 37 detached single family condominium homes, along with roadway and landscaping improvements on a 6.19-acre irregularly shaped property that is now occupied by a vacant two-story house, sheds and a kennel. The Project Applicant seeks a project that is consistent with predominant density of the neighborhood and to provide landscape features that provide natural character and texture within the neighborhood suburban environment. The new homes would have a maximum height of 36 feet, no architectural style has yet been determined. In order to minimize potential glare and night sky illumination no street lighting is proposed on the private drive between Mulholland.	Alternative 2 would develop 29 detached single family homes, along with roadway and landscaping improvements on the 6.19-acre property. The Project Applicant would be required to comply with the Specific Plan development standards in order to design a project that complements the view from Mulholland Drive.
2. Allowable Building Heights		
a. On an upslope lot, the height of any building or structure which is visible from Mulholland Drive and which is located within the first 100 feet from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, shall not exceed 15 feet as indicated on Figure A. When the elevation of the highest adjoining sidewalk or ground surface within a five foot horizontal distance of the exterior wall of a building exceeds grade by more than 20 feet, a building or structure may	The Applicant requests permission to exceed those height limits set for buildings on Upslope property within 500 feet of the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. Section 5 D 2 of the Specific Plan requires that buildings on upslope lots be limited to 15 feet within 100 feet of the ROW and limited to 30 feet between 100 feet and 500 feet of the ROW. A Specific Plan Exception related to building height will be needed for those pads which could be defined as upslope.	Alternative 2 would require a Specific Plan Exception, Viewshed to grant permission to encroach into the scenic parkway "viewshed" with a limited number of the residences.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
exceed the height in number of feet prescribed in this paragraph by not more than 12 feet. However, no such additional height shall cause any portion of to exceed a height of 15 feet, as measured from the highest point of the roof structure or parapet wall to the elevation of the ground surface which is vertically below said point of measurement.		
b. On an upslope lot, the height of any building or structures which is visible from Mulholland Drive and which is located more than 100 feet up to five hundred feet from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, shall not exceed 30 feet. When the elevation of the highest adjoining sidewalk or ground surface within a five foot horizontal distance of the exterior wall of a building exceeds grade by more than 20 feet, a building or structure may exceed the height in number of feet prescribed by not more than 12 feet. However, no such additional height shall cause any portion of the building or structure to exceed a height of 30 feet, as measured from the highest point of the roof structure or parapet wall to the elevation of the ground surface which is vertically below	The Applicant requests permission to exceed those height limits set for buildings on Upslope property within 500 feet of the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. Section 5 D 2 of the Specific Plan requires that buildings on upslope lots be limited to 15 feet within 100 feet of the ROW and limited to 30 feet between 100 feet and 500 feet of the ROW. A Specific Plan Exception related to building height will be needed for those pads which could be defined as upslope.	Alternative 2 would require a Specific Plan Exception, Viewshed to grant permission to encroach into the scenic parkway "viewshed" with a limited number of the residences.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
said point of measurement.		
c. On a downslope lot, the height of any building or structures which is visible from Mulholland Drive and which is located within 500 feet from the Mulholland Drive right-of-way, shall not exceed 40 feet, but in no event shall any building or structure exceed a height that would cause such building or structure to penetrate the viewshed. When the elevation of the highest adjoining sidewalk or ground surface within a five foot horizontal distance of the exterior wall of a building exceeds grade by more than 20 feet, a building or structure may exceed the height in number of feet prescribed by not more than 12 feet. However, no such additional height shall cause any portion of the building or structure to exceed a height of 40 feet, as measured from the highest point of the roof structure or parapet wall to the elevation of the ground surface which is vertically below said point of measurement.	Per the analysis found in Section V.B. Aesthetics, the 37 homes would have a maximum height of 36 feet and no homes on downslope pads were determined to exceed the height limitations of the Specific Plan. Refer to Section V.B. Aesthetics for a full analysis of height encroachment issues.	Per the analysis found in the preceding discussion, the 29 homes under Alternative 2 would have a maximum height of 33 feet and no homes on downslope pads were determined to exceed the height limitations of the Specific Plan.
3. Yard Requirements. Notwithstanding Z.A.I Case 1270, buildings and structures located on lots that abut the right-of-way and	The project site is composed of two parcels. Lot 1, which abuts Mulholland is irregularly shaped, and has a lot depth of at least 100 feet at all points.	Under Alternative 2, nine single-family lots with depths greater than 100 feet would abut the right-of-way.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
are 100 or more feet in depth shall be constructed with the following yards:		
a. Front – There shall be a front yard of not less than 20% of the depth of the lot, but which need not exceed 40 feet.	The front yard along Mulholland Drive is greater than or equal to 40 feet at all points along the frontage.	The front yards along Mulholland Drive are greater than or equal to 40 feet at all points along the frontage.
b. Side – There shall be a side yard on each side of the main building of not less than 10% of the width of the lot, but which need not exceed 20 feet.	The side yards are greater than or equal to 20 feet at all points along the side yard.	The side yards are greater than or equal to 10% of the width of the lot.
4. Fences, Gates and Walls. All fences, gates and walls visible from Mulholland Drive shall be constructed of the following materials: rough-cut, unfinished wood; native-type stone; split-face concrete block; textured plaster surface walls; black or dark green chain-link or wrought iron; or a combination thereof.	Although the architectural details have not yet been determined, the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	No architectural details for Alternative 2 are available. However, Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
5. Drain pipes laid on the ground and visible from Mulholland Drive shall be black or earth tone brown.	The proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
6. Utilities. The Advisory Agency, where feasible, shall require that all utilities installed in connection with the development of new subdivisions be placed underground.	The proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and place new utility lines underground where feasible.	Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and place new utility lines underground where feasible.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Roofs. All roofs visible from Mulholland Drive shall be surfaced with non-glare materials and no equipment shall be placed thereon. This provision shall not apply to solar energy devices.	Although the architectural design has not yet been determined, the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	No architectural design plans are available. However, Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
Section 7: MULHOLLAND DRIVE AND RIGHT OF WAY REGULATIONS **A. Changes and/or Improvements**		
No change or improvement may be made to the alignment or design of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive or the right-of-way, except for resurfacing and street and utility maintenance, without prior approval of the City Council acting after receipt of the recommendation of the Director.	The project would construct a 30-foot wide road in the Mulholland Drive right-of-way to provide primary access to the development area. No other improvements to either the paved portion of Mulholland Drive or the right-of-way are required or proposed. The traffic study prepared for the proposed project identified an optional measure of turn lanes to further improve traffic flow on Mulholland, but those turn lanes are not needed to mitigate traffic, are not recommended as mitigations measures, and are not included in the proposed project. If the City desires such turn lanes, then the City Planning Director would have to approve such turn lanes.	Alternative 2 would construct a 28-foot driveway and a 20-foot driveway in the right-of-way. If the City desires lanes, then the City Planning Director would have to approve such turn lanes.
B. Alignment and Design Any change or improvement to the alignment or design of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive or the right-of-way, except for resurfacing and street and utility maintenance, shall conform to the following standards:		
1. Roadway Alignment. The paved portion of Mulholland Drive shall conform to its existing alignment from California State Highway Route 101 to the	The proposed project would make no changes to the alignment or design of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive.	Alternative 2 would make no changes to the alignment or design of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
intersection of Topanga Canyon Boulevard, except as modified for safety reasons.		
2. Right-of-Way Width. The width of the right-of-way shall conform to its existing approximately 100-foot wide corridor east from Laurel Canyon Boulevard to the Hollywood Freeway (Route 101), and to the approximately 200-foot wide corridor west of Laurel Canyon Boulevard to the City-County boundary.	The proposed project would make no changes to the right-of-way width of Mulholland Drive.	Alternative 2 would make no changes to the right-of-way width of Mulholland Drive.
3. Travel Lanes and Shoulders. Except as provided in subdivision 4 of this Subsection, Mulholland Drive shall consist of two travel lanes, one in each direction with a maximum width of 15 feet per lane and one or more shoulders, except for existing improvements between Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Saltillo Street, Encino Hills Drive and Corda Drive, and Beverly Glen Boulevard and Benedict Canyon Drive. This shoulder shall be level with the roadway and shall serve as a bikeway. The shoulder shall be five feet wide, except that where a slope	The proposed project would make no changes to the travel lanes of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive or the width of the shoulder. The proposed project would comply with all DOT and Specific Plan requirements in regard to the posting of right-of way and parking signage.	Alternative 2 would make no changes to the travel lanes of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive or the width of the shoulder. Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all DOT and Specific Plan requirements in regard to the posting of right-of way and parking signage.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
is required to be graded in order to provide the five foot shoulder, the shoulder may be less than five feet wide. The shoulder or shoulders shall be paved with asphalt or black concrete and shall be separated from the travel lanes by a solid lane stripe in accordance with the adopted standards of the Department of Transportation. If less than five feet is available on each side of the roadway for shoulders, only the uphill shoulder shall be paved. The shoulder or shoulders shall be marked "Bike Lane" and "no Parking" on the pavement by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.		
7.C. Access to Mulholland Drive		
a. Turn lanes shall not be permitted without the prior recommendation of the Director after receipt of the recommendation of the Board. The Director shall recommend approval of a turn lane where the Department of Transportation has determined that the turn lane is required to facilitate traffic movement and for safety reasons.	The traffic study prepared for the proposed project identified an optional measure of turn lanes to further improve traffic flow on Mulholland, but those turn lanes are not needed to mitigate traffic, are not recommended as mitigations measures, and are not included in the proposed project. If the City desires such turn lanes, then the City Planning Director would have to approve such turn lanes.	Turn lanes are not needed to mitigate traffic, are not recommended as mitigations measures, and are not included in Alternative 2. If the City desires such turn lanes, then the City Planning Director would have to approve such turn lanes.
b. The turn lane shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide and the travel lane	The turn lanes, if required by the City, would be designed to the City's satisfaction.	The turn lanes, if required by the City, would be designed to the City's satisfaction.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
parallel to the turn lane shall be a maximum of 12 feet wide.		
5. Speed Limit. To the extent permitted by state law, the posted speed limit for vehicles shall prohibit speeds in excess of 25 miles per hour.	The proposed project would make no changes to the speed limit of Mulholland Drive.	Alternative 2 would make no changes to the speed limit of Mulholland Drive.
6. Sidewalks, Curbs and Berms. No sidewalks or curbs shall be permitted. Only berms required for drainage control and/or erosion shall be permitted.	The project does not propose to construct sidewalks or curbs on Mulholland Drive.	Alternative 2 does not propose to construct sidewalks or curbs on Mulholland Drive.
7. Median Strip. No median strip shall be constructed within the Mulholland Drive right-of-way.	The proposed project would make no changes to the alignment or design, including the provision of a median strip, of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive.	Alternative 2 would make no changes to the alignment or design, including the provision of a median strip, of the paved portion of Mulholland Drive.
8. Signs. The Department of Transportation shall post signs in the right-of-way indicating the location of the bikelane, core trail crossings, and the major vista points.	The proposed project would comply with all DOT and Specific Plan requirements in regard to the posting of right-of way signage.	Alternative 2 would be required to comply with all DOT and Specific Plan requirements in regard to the posting of right-of way signage.
9. Plant Material. Existing fire resistant, native-type plants and trees shall be preserved and maintained to enhance the natural scenic character of the parkway. No oak trees shall be removed, cut down, or moved without the prior recommendation of the Director	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval. A Conceptual Landscape Plan is included as Figure III-5. The proposed project would remove six Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak) trees to make way for the project's access road. The project applicant would seek an Oak Tree Removal Permit as part of the discretionary and ministerial	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval. Alternative 2 would remove eleven Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak) trees to make way for the development. The project applicant would seek an Oak Tree Removal Permit as part of the discretionary and ministerial actions requested from the

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
using the criteria set forth in Section 5 B 4 of this Specific Plan.	actions requested from the City. (see Section V.B, Aesthetics for further information)	City.
10. Existing Slopes. Existing slopes adjoining the roadway that show no signs of instability shall not be graded.	The slopes of the knoll in the southeast portion of the project site adjoining the roadway would not be graded. Grading plans for the proposed project would be subject to the review and approval of the City of Los Angeles Department Building and Safety.	The slopes of the knoll in the southeast portion of the project site adjoining the roadway would not be graded. Grading plans for Alternative 2 would be subject to the review and approval of the City of Los Angeles Department Building and Safety.
11. Rock Formations and Outcroppings. All natural rock formations and/or outcroppings, known or discovered during grading, should be preserved on-site and incorporated into the street design.	There are no natural rock formations and/or outcroppings, as defined by the Specific Plan, located on the project site.	There are no natural rock formations and/or outcroppings, as defined by the Specific Plan, located on the project site.
7.C. Access to Mulholland Drive		
1. Driveway Access. No driveway may intersect Mulholland Drive without the prior recommendation of the Director after receipt of the recommendation of the Board.	No driveways intersecting Mulholland Drive are proposed. Direct access to the project site would be provided by a 30-foot roadway from a main entrance on Mulholland Drive and from a secondary entrance on San Feliciano Drive. This private roadway would provide internal circulation. All driveways take access from the internal circulation.	Alternative 2 would provide 2 driveways intersecting Mulholland Drive. In addition, direct access to the project site would be provided by a 54-foot cul-de-sac roadway from San Feliciano Drive. This public roadway would provide internal circulation for 17 of the homes.
7.E. Features		
1. Sodium and mercury vapor lamps shall be prohibited.	The proposed project does not include the installation of any new street lighting along the private access road between Mulholland and San Feliciano Drive, or along Mulholland Drive. In addition, the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	Alternative 2 would provide a fully improved 54-foot access cul-de-sac. Street lighting would be part of the full improvements. Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan, including the use of sodium and mercury vapor lamps.
2. Lighting standards within the	If required, lighting standards for the proposed project would	If required, lighting standards for Alternative 2 would

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
right-of-way shall use cut-off type fixtures which focus the light directly onto the street and shoulders.	comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
3. Lighting standards shall be located only in the immediate vicinity of major vista points and major intersections, except as provided in subdivision 5 of this Subsection.	If required, the location of lighting standards for the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	If required, the location of lighting standards for the Alternative 2 would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
4. The lamp shall cast a white light, similar to metal halide or incandescent lighting.	If required, lighting standards, including lamping, for the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	If required, lighting standards, including lamping, for the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
5. Where the Board of Public Works determines that a lighting standard is needed to improve parkway safety, the location and design of said lighting standard shall have the prior recommendation of the Director after receipt of the recommendation of the Board. The Director may recommend approval of the location and design of a lighting standard after making the following findings:	If required, parkway safety lighting standards for the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.	If required, parkway safety lighting standards for Alternative 2 would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.
a. The lighting standard does not obstruct a scenic feature or resource.	If required, parkway safety lighting standards for the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.	If required, parkway safety lighting standards for Alternative 2 would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.
b. The lighting standard complements the views from	If required, lighting standards for the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic	If required, lighting standards for Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
Mulholland Drive.	Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
c. The lighting fixture proposed to be used reduces the visual intrusion of lighting into the right-of-way.	If required, lighting fixtures for the proposed project would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	If required, lighting fixtures for Alternative 2 would be subject to review and approval by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board and must comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.
6. Existing lighting standards located in the right-of-way between Corda Drive and Encino Hills Drive, between Beverly Glen Boulevard and Benedict Canyon Drive, between Skyline Drive and Laurel Pass Avenue, between Laurel Canyon Boulevard and Dona Pegita Drive, and at Woodcliff Road should be redesigned by the Department of Public Works to reduce the glare, and cut-off fixtures should be installed to focus the light directly onto Mulholland Drive and the shoulders.	The project site is not within any of these right-of-way areas.	The project site is not within any of these right-of-way areas.
7.E. Features		
1. All guard rails shall be constructed according to Bureau of Engineering standards and shall have a wood facing treated and finished to achieve a rustic and/or	No guard rails are proposed. If required, guard rails would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.	No guard rails are proposed. If required, guard rails would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan.

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
natural appearance.		
2. All historic survey monuments set during the original survey for Mulholland Drive shall be preserved at their original location.	No historic survey monuments are known to exist on the project site. However, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.	No historic survey monuments are known to exist on the project site. However, Alternative 2 would comply with the requirements of the Specific Plan and the recommendations and subsequent findings of the Board of Public Works.
SECTION 10: LANDSCAPING **10.A. Standards.** Any public or private landscaping installed on or after the effective date of this Specific Plan shall conform to the following standards:		
1. Graded Slopes. Graded slopes shall be landform graded in accordance with the provisions of the Landform Grading Manual, unless the Department of Building and Safety has determined that landform grading will conflict with the provisions of Divisions 29 and 70 of Article 1 of Chapter IX of the Code. Slopes which cannot be landform graded shall be landform planted in accordance with the provisions of the Landform Grading Manual. Landscaping shall be installed within six (6) months of the completion of any grading.	Steepness of topography has been taken into consideration during site planning: 65.6% of the project site has slope gradients of 10% or less; 6.9% of the site has slope gradients between 10 and 15%; and 27.5% of the site has slope gradients over 15%. Site development has been located on the gentler slopes to the extent feasible. Manufactured slopes would have a maximum horizontal to vertical ration of 2 to 1. The project would utilize retaining walls in lieu of manufactured slopes in order to preserve as many oak trees on the site as possible. A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.	Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would utilize retaining walls in lieu of manufactured slopes in order to preserve as many oak trees and walnuts on the site as possible. A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.
2. Location. Plant material in the inner corridor shall not obstruct the view from Mulholland Drive and the right-of-way.	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.
3. Type. Landscaping shall predominantly consist of native-type fire resistant plant materials.	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

<table>
<tr><th>Regulation</th><th>Proposed Project</th><th>Alternative 2</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>and approval.</td><td>review and approval.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Oak Trees. Oak trees shall not be removed except as set forth in Sections 5 B 4 or 7 B 9 of this Specific Plan.</td><td>The location of the existing trees on site was taken into consideration during site planning with the majority of the existing trees (156 out of 186) being preserved in place. However, the proposed project would remove six coast live oak trees to make way for the project’s access road. The project applicant would seek an Oak Tree Removal Permit as part of the discretionary and ministerial actions requested from the City.</td><td>See analyses of Sections 5.B.4 and 7.B.9, above</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Replacement Trees. Native trees, including oak trees, which are removed shall be replaced with the same type of tree according to the following replacement schedule:
<table><tr><th>TYPE OF TREE</th><th>REPLACEMENT SIZE AND QUANTITY</th></tr><tr><td>Quercus agrifolia, Q. lobata, Q. Virginiana</td><td>36-inch box (2 for 1 replacement)</td></tr><tr><td>All other.</td><td>15 gallon (2 for 1 replacement)</td></tr></table></td><td>The proposed project would remove a total of 30 trees, including six Quercus agrifolia. Thus requiring the following; 12 – 36” box Q. agrifolia replacement trees and 48 – 15-gallon trees to replace the remaining native and non-native removals. A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.</td><td>Alternative 2 would remove a total of 41 trees, including eleven Quercus agrifolia. Thus requiring the following; 14 – 36” box Q. agrifolia replacement trees and 42 – 15-gallon trees to replace the remaining native and non-native removals. A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Maintenance. An automatic irrigation system shall be installed where necessary to sustain plants and trees and a fire resistant</td><td>A Landscape Plan, including irrigation plans, for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.</td><td>A Landscape Plan, including irrigation plans, for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and</td></tr>
</table>

Table VII-5
Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan

Regulation	Proposed Project	Alternative 2
corridor.		approval.
10. B. Prohibited Plant Material		
The following plant material shall not be planted in the scenic corridor parkway on or after the effective date of this Specific Plan. (Refer to Specific Plan text, page 22 for list of prohibited plant material).	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.
1. A landscape plan shall be submitted to the Board for review and recommendation.	A Landscape Plan for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.	A Landscape Plan for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.
2. Landscape plans shall include the approximate size at maturity and location of all proposed plant materials, the scientific and common names of such plant materials, the proposed irrigation plan and the estimated planting schedule. The plan shall identify the length of time in which plant maturity will be attained.	A Landscape Plan, including irrigation plans, for the proposed project in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.	A Landscape Plan, including irrigation plans, for Alternative 2 in compliance with Specific Plan requirements would be submitted to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Design Review Board for review and approval.

Viewshed Analysis

A viewshed analysis was conducted for Alternative 2, as was done for the proposed project (see Section V.F., Land Use).

Methodology. The same methodology used to assess the proposed project was used to assess Alternative 2. The cross-sections along which the impacts were analyzed are shown in Figure VII-4 and the corresponding profiles are shown in Figures VII-5 and VII-6. The results of the analysis are documented in Table VII-6 and graphically depicted in Figure VII-7. The following analysis is based on close examination of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, and the Design and Preservation Guidelines, as well as conversations with Daniel O'Donnel, Unit Head for the Specific Plan community area.

As explained in Section V.F. (Land Use), the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan and Design and Preservation Guidelines as written, do not wholly explain how one would conduct the required viewshed analysis under the specific circumstances of the proposed project, as these documents reflect a situation of one building on one lot abutting Mulholland Drive. Contrary to the proposed project, which consists of 37 homes on two lots, Alternative 2 involves 29 single-family residences, each on a separate lot. Therefore, the methodology for Alternative 2 requires that the impact of each lot on the project site as a whole should be evaluated. Further, under Alternative 2 some of the lots abut Mulholland and some do not, although all lots could potentially impact the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. For each of these reasons, direct application of the Guidelines, absent interpretation, is not possible. Guideline 19 of the Specific Plan, would require classification of a lot as upslope or downslope based on the comparison of the highest elevation of the building pad, to the lowest elevation of the Mulholland Drive right-of-way (the "ROW") contiguous to the property. For Alternative 2, this comparison is only possible for a fraction of the lots, as not all lots are contiguous to the Mulholland ROW. In the following analysis, the same cross-sections that were used in the analysis of the proposed project were applied in the analysis of Alternative 2. These cross-sections were used for the determination of upslope versus downslope for lots not contiguous to Mulholland, and then the visual impact was considered along the entire project frontage. Thus, the approach to the analysis was conducted as suggested in the Guidelines for lots contiguous to Mulholland, and for lots not contiguous to Mulholland, the following steps were used:

1. Determine upslope or downslope – a point in front of each adjacent lot to Mulholland was used and those lines were extended for the non-contiguous lots. These different elevation points along the ROW are used and the results are that all lots are downsloping.

Figure VII-4, Alternative 2 Viewshed Sections

Figure VII-5, Alternative 2 Viewshed Profiles "A-A" through "G-G"

Figure VII-6, Alternative 2 Viewshed Profiles "H-H" through "M-M"

Figure VII-7, Alternative 2 Viewshed Impact Analysis

Table VII-6, Alternative 2 Viewshed Analysis (page 1)

Table VII-6, Alternative 2 Viewshed Analysis (page 2)

Table VII-6, Alternative 2 Viewshed Analysis (page 3)

2. If upslope – consider the allowable building height and encroachment into the 15 foot height limitation within 100 feet of Mulholland and the 30 foot height limitation between 100 and 500 feet of Mulholland.

3. If downslope – consider the encroachment into the required viewshed, as described in Guideline 19.

4. Calculate the encroachment – when calculating the height and/or viewshed encroachment, use multiple vectors perpendicular to the ROW. Use the fewest amount of vectors needed to intersect all pads.

5. Note intervening physical features[1] – the attached table (explained below) lists the *Calculated Theoretical Impact*, which notes the extent of the encroachment without consideration of physical realities, as well as the *Practical Impact* which documents the overall impact taking into consideration intervening vegetation, topography and structures.

In the following visual impact analysis, since the purpose of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan and Design and Preservation Guidelines is to preserve and enhance the unique character and scenic features of Mulholland, a "worst case scenario" approach is used for the analysis. Each residence not contiguous to Mulholland is examined under both upslope and downslope conditions. The determination of upslope versus downslope as described in Number 1 above is documented in the *Upslope vs. Downslope* column. Following that column, the columns for *If Downslope – Viewshed Encroachment* and *If Upslope – Height Violation* are listed. Thus, for lots not contiguous to Mulholland, the Analysis considers the potential impacts of either interpretation of the Guidelines. For the ten lots contiguous to Mulholland, either the upslope or downslope conditions was considered as indicated in the Table VII-6. For all lots, the practical impact of intervening physical features was considered.

Results of Visual Impact Analysis

As presented in Table VII-6 and depicted in Figure VII-7, the potential visible impact from Mulholland Drive, is completely eliminated by intervening topography, vegetation and/or structures for the majority of residences. Units 2, 6, 8 and 10 through 28 (or 76% of all the homes) would be entirely screened from view at all points along the Mulholland right-of-way contiguous with the property. Units 3, 4 and 5 are the only residences wholly visible from Mulholland, although these units would be blocked from view at some points along Mulholland. The remaining residences (i.e., 1, 7, 9 and 29) may be partially visible from one or more points along Mulholland, but are substantially screened by intervening vegetation,

[1] *While it is understood that determination of a viewshed encroachment or height violation is based on the calculated impact as outlined in the Specific Plan and Guidelines, the Practical Impact section was included to provide a more complete picture of the impacts the project will have on the Mulholland Scenic Parkway.*

topography and/or structures as indicated. It should also be noted that in no case was a retaining wall determined to add a visual obstruction beyond that created by residential units.

Noise

Under this alternative, the amount of landform alteration would be less than that under the proposed project and therefore construction-related noise impacts would be of a shorter duration. However, as the design of Alternative 2 is very similar to that of the proposed project, and is spread over a slightly larger area of the project site, it is likely that short-term construction-related noise levels experienced at the off-site, noise-sensitive uses would still exceed the City's "conditionally acceptable" exterior noise standard for single-family homes. Construction noise under Alternative 2 would also exceed the City's noise standard of 75 dBA at 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery, as stated in Section 112.05 of the LAMC. Therefore, construction-related noise impacts would still be a significant and unavoidable impact, however, due to the shorter duration of construction, these significant impacts would be of a lesser magnitude than the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

The construction 29 single-family residences would generate approximately 22 percent fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project and therefore vehicular noise emissions would be proportionally less than those associated with the proposed project. The proposed project's operational noise impacts would be less than significant, therefore, Alternative 2's operational noise impacts would also be less than significant and less than those associated with the proposed project.

Traffic

Under Alternative 2, the construction of 29 single-family residences would generate approximately 22 percent fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project. As traffic impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant, so traffic impacts associated with Alternative 2 would also be less than significant and of a lesser magnitude than the proposed project's less than significant impacts. Under Alternative 2, each home would provide two covered parking spaces in garages, per current City of Los Angeles Municipal Code regulations (two spaces per dwelling unit). A total of 58 covered parking spaces would be provided. Therefore, parking impacts would also be less than significant.

Alternative 3: Park Alternative

Under this alternative the 6.19 acre project site would be acquired by a public agency and developed as a public park. According to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, there is some possibility that the Conservancy, the Department of Recreation and Parks or the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) could take over ownership and/or management of all but the northeastern one acre of the adjacent DWP's 5.91-acre Girard reservoir property.[2] If one of these agencies were also to acquire the project site, which abouts almost 50 percent of the Girard Reservoir perimeter, a public park of approximately 11 acres could be created by combining the two properties. Note: the Park Alternative does not meet the applicant's objectives. It is included in this discussion in responses to requests from the community for its assessment.

Because of the scenic value of the oak woodland adjacent to the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway, such a park would most likely not be developed for active recreation, but rather would be utilized as a wildlife refuge and for such passive recreational activities as hiking and bird watching. This alternative assumes that the extent of improvements on the project site's portion of the park would be limited to the demolition of the existing house, sheds, kennels and hardscape features, the removal of the surrounding chain-link fencing, the removal of non-native landscaping, and the subsequent restoration of the native habitat. While no new structures would be built on the park property, it is reasonable to assume that some landform alteration would occur on-site to provide access and parking. This alternative assumes that a graded and paved parking area would be located in the southwestern corner of the project site where the terrain is most level. Access would then be provided by a driveway on San Feliciano Drive. Like other small parks in the general vicinity, it is assumed that this park would be unstaffed, unlocked, and open from dawn to dusk.

Environmental Impacts

Aesthetics

Under the Park alternative, no new construction of structures visible within the protected viewshed of the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway would occur on the project site, although the existing single-family residence and associated sheds and aged kennel would be demolished. Also, the non-native trees and shrubs would also be removed and the native habitat would be restored. No oak, black walnut or other native trees or shrubs would be removed from the project site. No views of the onsite oak woodland would be obstructed. No retaining walls would be constructed and no new sources of night lighting would be added. Consequently, the most prominent features that currently detract from the aesthetic qualities of the project site would be removed, while no new features would be constructed .

---

[2] *Correspondence from Elizabeth A. Cheadle, Chairperson, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to Jonathon Riker, Environmental Review Section, Los Angeles City Planning Department, December 5, 2005*

It is likely that under the Park Alternative, the existing low retaining wall on San Feliciano Drive would remain as an unattractive feature of the project site although the unsightly chain link fencing that surrounds the property would be dismantled to improve access and to removed barriers to wildlife movement. It is expected that as part of the habitat restoration efforts, the weedy growth along San Feliciano would also be removed. However, the unsightly overhead utility lines would likely remain in their current location and would not be placed underground.

In balance, the Park Alternative would eliminate the significant aesthetic impacts associated with the proposed project and would enhance the aesthetic values of the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Under this alternative demolition of the on-site structures and some small amount of grading and landscaping may occur. While the demolition activities and the resultant emissions would be the same under the proposed project and the Park Alternative, there would be substantially less grading and practically no construction-related emissions under the Park Alternative. While the proposed project's construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant, the construction–related impacts under the Park Alternative would be substantially less than that associated with the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, no new construction of large structures or paved roadways would occur on the project site, including tree and vegetation removal and grading. Limited construction of auxiliary park features (i.e., restrooms, trails, fences) and removal of non-native vegetation may occur as part of park development and maintenance, which may result in temporary impacts to special status species; however, these impacts would be very limited and of a much lower magnitude than the impacts associated with the proposed project. In addition, the long-term benefits of the habitat protection and enhancement would result in overall beneficial impacts to special status species and common plant and animal species. Also, under this alternative, it is likely that no protected trees or sensitive plant communities would be removed or adversely impacted.

Hazards

As for the proposed project, under this alternative demolition of the existing onsite structures would take place under both the proposed project and the Park alternative. There is the potential that these structures contain ACMs and/or lead-based paint, the release of which into the environment could result in significant adverse health affects. However, demolition activities under either the proposed project or the Park alternative would be subject to the EPA and SCAQMD rules and regulations to ensure safe and proper removal and disposal of these materials. With adherence to these regulations, no significant impacts would result from ACM or lead-based paint removal.

Because vehicular access to the Park's parking area would be from San Feliciano Drive and not from Mulholland Drive, the Park alternative would have less potential for the accidental rupture of the oil pipelines located in the Mulholland Drive right-of-way. Furthermore, standard operating procedures for construction in the vicinity of known pipelines, generally consisting of notification and marking requirements, including but not limited to contacting of Underground Service Alert of Southern California (Dig Alert) a minimum of two full working days (48-hours) prior to the commencement of earthmoving activities would still be followed, ensuring impacts are kept to less than significant levels. Consequently, while the potential for hazardous material impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant, the Park Alternative would have even less of an impact.

Land Use

Neither the proposed project nor the Park Alternative would place a barrier between existing land uses or prevent free movement along existing north-south or east-west corridors. Therefore, neither the proposed project nor the Park Alternative would physically divide any established communities, and there would be no impact under either. The development of a park on the project site would be compatible with the existing R1 zoning and the Low Residential land use designation. Also, a park on the project site would be more compatible than a residential development with the Mulholland Drive Scenic Parkway Specific Plan's intended purpose of preserving the aesthetic qualities of the scenic parkway. Therefore, under the Park Alternative there would be less potential conflict with the Specific Plan. As there are no habitat conservation plans or community conservation plans that are applicable to the project site, neither the proposed project nor the park Alternative would conflict with any habitat conservation plan or community conservation plan and there would be no impact.

Noise

Under this alternative demolition of the on-site structures and some small amount of grading and landscaping may occur. However, it would be substantially less than that associated with the proposed project and therefore noise impacts would be less than the proposed project's significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts. For operational noise impacts, no residences would be located onsite, therefore no impacts related to rooftop heating, ventilation and air conditioning [HVAC] systems would occur. A small park would generate fewer operational vehicle trips that the proposed project and therefore, noise impacts associated with vehicle trips would be less than significant under this alternative and less than the proposed project's less than significant operational vehicle noise impacts.

Traffic

Under a Park alternative approximately 34 daily vehicle trips would be generated by visitors (approximately 0 AM peak hour trips and 1 PM peak hour trip). In comparison, the proposed project would generate approximately 354 daily vehicle trips (approximately 28 AM peak hour trips and 37 PM peak hour trips). Traffic impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant. The Park

alternative would generate less traffic and therefore would further reduce the traffic impact.

Table VII-7
Traffic Generation Comparison

Project	Daily Trips	AM Peak-Hour Trips		PM Peak-Hour Trips	
		In	Out	In	Out
Park Alternative	34	0	0	0	1
Proposed Project	354	7	21	23	14

Source: Crain & Associates, November 2004 and February 2006

Environmentally Superior Alternative

In general, the environmentally superior alternative, as defined by CEQA, should minimize adverse impacts to the project site and its surrounding environment. Of the alternatives considered, the "No Project Alternative" does not create any new impacts; therefore, it is environmentally superior to a project which proposes to change existing conditions. However, CEQA requires the identification of another "environmentally superior" alternative when the No Project Alternative is chosen. A comparison of the alternatives reveals that Alternative 3 – Park Alternative, involves less environmental disruption (less grading, less construction-related air quality and noise impacts, less intrusive visual quality impacts, fewer impacts to biological resources, fewer land use impacts and less potential for pipeline-related hazards). Consequently, as shown in Table VII-8, of the alternatives discussed in this EIR, the Park Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, the Park Alternative has been rejected by the project applicant because it fails to meet any of the project objectives, there has been no commitment from the Department of Water and Power to release the 5.91-acre Girard reservoir property for park purposes and there has been no offer from any public agency or private organization to purchase the project site for park purposes.

Therefore, of the remaining alternatives, Alternative 2 - No Zone Change (Single-Family Residential Subdivision) can be considered the environmentally superior alternative because: (1) it does not require a zone change; (2) it would introduce a lesser density project into the neighborhood; (3) it would generate fewer daily vehicle trips; (4) it would develop traditional single-family lot ownerships, rather than condominiums; and (5) it would more effectively screen the proposed homes from view from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway. However, Alternative 2 would increase impacts to protected species trees, would require greater landform alternations and would involve the export of approximately 2,500 cubic yards of excess dirt from the project site.

Table VII-8
Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternative Impacts

Issue Area	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project (No Construction)	Alternative 2 No Zone Change (Single-Family Residential Subdivision)	Alternative 3 Park Alternative
Aesthetics	S	NS(-)	S	NS(-)
Air Quality				
Construction	NS	NS(-)	NS(-)	NS(-)
Operations	NS	NS(-)	NS(-)	NS(-)
Hazards	NS	NS(-)	NS(-)	NS (-)
Land Use	NS	NS (-)	NS (-)	NS (-)
Noise				
Construction	S	NS(-)	S	NS(-)
Operations	NS	NS(-)	NS(-)	NS(-)
Traffic	NS	NS(-)	NS(-)	NS(-)

Notes:

NS = Impacts would not be significant.

S= Significant impacts.

(-)=Impacts would be less than the proposed project.

(+)=Impacts would be greater than the proposed project.