

**INITIAL STUDY**  
**VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61553**

**PREPARED FOR:**  
City of Los Angeles  
Planning Department  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**OWNER/APPLICANT:**  
DS Ventures  
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000  
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

**PREPARED BY:**  
Christopher A. Joseph & Associates  
31255 Cedar Valley Drive, suite 222  
Westlake Village, CA 91362

August 2005

---

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

---

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	I-1
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	II-1
Environmental Setting .....	II-1
Proposed Project Description.....	II-20
III. INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST .....	III-1
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.....	IV-1
1. Aesthetics .....	IV-1
2. Agriculture.....	IV-2
3. Air Quality.....	IV-3
4. Biological Resources.....	IV-6
5. Cultural Resources .....	IV-8
6. Geology and Soils .....	IV-12
7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	IV-16
8. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	IV-20
9. Land Use Planning .....	IV-24
10. Mineral Resources.....	IV-25
11. Noise.....	IV-26
12. Population and Housing .....	IV-28
13. Public Services.....	IV-30
14. Recreation.....	IV-32
15. Transportation and Traffic .....	IV-33
16. Utilities and Service Systems.....	IV-36
17. Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	IV-41
V. PREPARERS OF INITIAL STUDY AND PERSONS CONSULTED .....	V-1

---

---

## FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
II-1	Regional Location .....	II-2
II-2	Vicinity Map .....	II-3
II-3	Aerial Photograph .....	II-4
II-4	Photograph Location Map .....	II-7
II-5	Photographic Views 1 and 2.....	II-8
II-6	Photographic Views 3 and 4.....	II-8
II-7	Photographic Views 5 and 6.....	II-9
II-8	Photographic Views 7and 8.....	II-10
II-9	Photographic Views 9 and 10 .....	II-11
II-10	Photographic Views 11 and 12.....	II-12
II-11	Photographic Views 13 and 14.....	II-12
II-12	Photographic Views 15 and 16.....	II-12
II-13	Photographic Views 17 and 18.....	II-12
II-14	Photographic Views 19 and 20.....	II-12
II-15	Photographic Views 21 and 22.....	II-12
II-16	Photographic Views 23 and 24.....	II-12
II-17	Site Plan .....	II-22
II-18	Location of Related Projects.....	II-26

## TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
II-1	Existing Slope Analysis .....	II-1
II-2	Proposed Building Summary .....	II-20
II-3	Project Area Summary .....	II-21
II-4	List of Related Projects.....	II-25
IV-1	Regulatory Database Results .....	IV-19
IV-2	Future (2007) Traffic Conditions With Project (Gated Access and Without Gated Access).....	IV-36

## APPENDICES

- A. Horticultural Tree Report
- B. Phase I Archaeological Survey
- C. Paleontologic Resource Evaluation
- D. Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration
- E. Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment- Phase I
- F. Traffic Analysis

---

---

# I. INTRODUCTION

---

---

## **Introduction**

The subject of this Initial Study (IS) is the proposed development of 37 detached condominiums. The project site is located at 22255 Mulholland Drive (community of Woodland Hills) in the City of Los Angeles. The project applicant/developer is DS Ventures, located at 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000, Beverly Hills, CA 90211. A description of the proposed project is contained in Section II (Project Description). The City of Los Angeles Planning Department is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

## **Project Information**

Project Title: Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61553

Project Location: 22255 Mulholland Drive

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles

Contact Person: Mr. Nick Hendricks, City Planner  
200 N. Spring Street, Suite 750  
Los Angeles, California, 90012

## **Organization of Initial Study**

This Initial Study is organized into six sections as follows:

Introduction: This section provides introductory information such as the project title, the project applicant and the lead agency for the proposed project.

Project Description: This section provides a detailed description of the environmental setting and the proposed project, including project characteristics and environmental setting.

Initial Study Checklist: This section contains the completed Initial Study Checklist.

Environmental Impact Analysis: Each environmental issue identified in the Initial Study Checklist contains an assessment and discussion of impacts associated with each subject area. When the evaluation identifies potentially significant effects, as identified in the Checklist, mitigation measures are provided to reduce such impacts to less than significant levels.

Preparers of Initial Study and Persons Consulted: This section provides a list of City personnel, other governmental agencies, and consultant team members that participated in the preparation of the IS.

Appendices: Includes various documents and information used in the preparation of the IS, including the City of Los Angeles Environmental Assessment Form (EAF).

---

---

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Project Site

The 6.19-acre project site is located in the Los Angeles City community of Woodland Hills. It is located approximately 2 miles south of the Ventura Freeway (I-101), approximately 11 miles from the San Diego Freeway (I-405) and approximately 25 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles. The irregularly-shaped project site is bound by San Feliciano Drive to the north, Mulholland Drive to the south, Girard Reservoir to the east and single-family residences to the west. The regional location of the project site is presented in Figure II-1, while its local vicinity is indicated on Figure II-2.

The proposed 6.19-acre project site is surrounded by a chain link fence and consists of a single parcel of land. A vacant two-story single-family residence, sheds and an aged kennel occupy the project site. These structures are located at the east-central portion of the property along Mulholland Drive. The remaining portion of land is undeveloped, open space occupied by various trees (i.e., coast live oak, Southern California black walnut and Mexican fan palm), shrubs, low-lying weeds and grasses. The current structures and vegetation would be removed and replaced with the 37 detached single-family condominium units.

As the project site is located in the hills of the Santa Monica Mountains, the topography of the project site and the surrounding area is variable with elevation changes, although the general trend is of a decreasing slope while moving northward (see Figure II-3). The surface elevation on the irregularly-shaped site fluctuates, with the southwestern edge approximately 1,048 feet above mean sea level (msl), decreasing to approximately 1,000 feet above msl toward the northern edge of the project site. The surface elevations at the central and southeastern edge of the project site are approximately 1,015 and 1,020 msl, respectively. Table II-1 summarizes the slope of existing site topography.

**Table II-1**  
**Existing Slope Analysis**

Slope Category	Square Footage	Percentage of Site Area
10% or Less	177,096 sq. ft.	65.6 %
10% - 15%	18,620 sq. ft.	6.9%
15% and Over	74,140 sq. ft.	27.5%



**Figure II-1, Regional Map**

**Figure II-2, Vicinity Map**

**Figure II-3 Aerial Photo**



The existing topography consists of a north-draining main canyon and a secondary canyon. A north-trending bedrock spur-ridge separates the main and easterly secondary canyon. The existing residential structures were built on the bedrock ridge. Minor cut and fill grading techniques were employed to create level building sites for the structures. Past grading, associated with the construction of Mulholland Drive has consisted of placing fill where the roadway crosses the main and secondary canyons. Fill was also placed along the margins of the main canyon and within a secondary canyon to support residential development and San Feliciano Drive to the west. The abandoned Girard Reservoir was created by placing fill within the main canyon.

There are a total of 186 trees on the project site, of which 30 would be removed for construction of the proposed project. Six (6) of those 30 trees are coast live oaks. Other trees to be removed include: one (1) Apple, nine (9) Mexican Fan Palms, one (1) King Palm, one (1) Fig, five (5) Southern California Black Walnuts, one (1) English Walnut and six (6) Mexican Elderberries. 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 proposed project site.

### ***Existing Site Zoning/Land Use***

The project site is within the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan Area, which designates the project site as Low Residential, which allows residential densities up to 9 units per net acre. The project site is zoned a residential designation of R1 in the No. 1 Height District, which allows structures up to 45 feet. As described in the Community Plan, the project site also lies within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (“Specific Plan”) area, which is comprised of Mulholland Drive and the surrounding area. The project site is located within 500 feet of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway right-of-way, which is referred to as the Inner Corridor. The Specific Plan contains density requirements, building standards and grading restrictions that are applicable to the Inner Corridor.

### **Surrounding Area**

As shown in Figure II-3, the surrounding area is almost entirely developed with suburban uses. Properties to the north, east and west of the project site consist of one- and two-story single-family residences. These properties are all zoned R1-1 (Residential One-Family) with a Height District Designation of “1”. In addition, the Girard Reservoir and the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Pumping Station are located to the northeast of the project site and are also zone R1-1. The properties to the south of the project site consist of a private high school and convent, undeveloped land, a two-story commercial building with a surface parking lot and a small shopping center, anchored by a Gelson’s Supermarket. Approximately 365 feet south of the project site, along Mulholland Highway, the City of Calabasas begins. The Louisville High School and Convent property is zoned RE15-1-H, houses multiple structures and contains a surface parking which parallels

Mulholland Drive. The two-story commercial building, called Mulholland Plaza, is located at the southwest corner of the intersection between Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway. The shopping center, called Gelson's Village Calabasas, is located in the jurisdiction of the City of Calabasas and is adjacent to Mulholland Plaza, consisting of retail and commercial stores including a Gelson's Supermarket, yoga studio, Washington Mutual Bank, and dry cleaners. Adjacent to Gelson's Village Calabasas is a Shell gas station.

No endangered habitat is expected to occur in the area due to the substantial level of existing suburban development. No surface water features or vegetation indicative of wetland areas (i.e., cattails and sedges) are found in the project area.<sup>1</sup> There are no City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments near the project site.<sup>2</sup> There are scenic vistas identified for the surrounding area.<sup>3</sup>

Photographs of the project site and surrounding area, including a photograph location map, are presented in Figures II-4 through II-16.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wildflower Productions, *TOPO! Interactive Maps on CD-ROM, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Surrounding Rec. Areas*, version 2.3.2 (or upgraded to 2.7.8), 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Source: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, *Historic-Cultural Monument Report*, website: <http://www.lacity.org/pln/complan/HCM/hcm.cfm>, July 26, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*, State of California Department of Transportation, website <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>, July 26, 2004.

**Figure II-4, Photograph Location Map**

**Figure II-5, Views 1 and 2**

**Figure II-6, Views 3 and 4**

**Figure II-7, Views 5 and 6**

**Figure II-8, Views 7 and 8**

**Figure II-9, Views 9 and 10**

**Figure II-10, Views, 11 and 12**

**Figure II-11, Views, 13 and 14**

**Figure II-12, Views, 15 and 16**

**Figure II-13, Views, 17 and 18**

**Figure II-14, Views, 19 and 20**

**Figure II-15, Views, 21 and 22**

**Figure II-16, Views, 23 and 24**



## PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is the subdivision of a 6.1951-acre, irregularly shaped property into two lots and the subsequent development of 37 detached, single-family condominium homes. The proposed development is shown in Figure II-17, Site Plan.

### General Project Features

Three Single-family unit types are envisioned: Units A, B and C. Each unit would have three or four bedrooms and would have a maximum height of three stories or 36 feet, as established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Inner Corridor regulations. Each unit would include a two-car garage. There would be no basements, subterranean floors and no stepped pads. Architectural style has not yet been determined; nor have floor plans, elevations, or renderings yet been developed. Table II-2 provides a summary the 37 proposed condominiums.

**Table II-2  
Proposed Building Summary**

Condominium Units	Number of Units	Building Footprint	Total Building Coverage
Unit A	13	30' X 40'	15,600 sq. ft.
Unit B	14	35' X40'	19,600 sq. ft.
Unit C	10	35' X 45'	15,750 sq. ft.
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>50,950 sq. ft.</b>

Of the project site's 6.1951 acres of total area (269,856.8 square feet), building footprint coverage would account for approximately 50,950 square feet (or 18.9% of the total project site). An additional area of 37,646 square feet (or 14.0% of the project site) would be covered by other forms of impervious surfaces, such as roads, driveways, patios and walkways. A total area of 37,500 square feet (or 13.9% of the project site) would be covered with landscaping. Landscaping would consist of approximately 3,500 square feet of common area and 34,000 square feet of private landscaping associated with the proposed homes. In addition, there would be 103,135 square feet (or 38.27% of the project site) of undisturbed open space and 40,626 square feet (or 17.7% of the project site) of private open space. A homeowners' association would be responsible for the maintenance of the open space. Table II-3 summarizes the project area statistics.



Figure II-17, Site Plan



**Table II-3  
Project Area Summary**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Square Footage</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Site Area</b>
Building Footprint Coverage	50,950 sq. ft.	18.9%
Other Paved Surfaces	37,646 sq. ft.	14.0%
Landscape Areas	37,500 sq. ft.	13.9%
Open Space	143,761 sq. ft.	53.2%
Total	269,856.8	100%

### **Parking**

The project would a total of 74 covered parking spaces (two per unit in garages) and 19 guest parking spaces. The locations of proposed guest parking are shown on Figure II-17.

### **Street Lighting**

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. Such special lighting for would be determined during the construction phase.

### **Grading**

Grading for the proposed project would involve the excavation of approximately 10,700 cubic yards. All excavated material would be used as fill on the project site. Grading would be balanced onsite - there would be no import or export of graded materials.

The Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Inner Corridor regulations limit grading to one (1) cubic yard per four (4) square feet of lot area. In total, the Specific Plans regulations would permit 67,396 cubic yards of grading ( $269,857 \div 4 = 67,396$ ). The project's grading is in compliance with the Specific Plan's grading requirements.

All manufactured slopes would have a maximum horizontal to vertical ratio of 2 to 1. The project would utilize retaining walls in lieu of slopes to preserve additional oaks. Three retaining walls are proposed. The first is an irregularly-shaped wall that begins on the south side of the main Mulholland Drive entrance to the project site and extends southerly, roughly parallel to Mulholland Drive, and

terminates at building pad #35. The second is an irregularly-shaped wall that starts near the northeast corner of the project site and wraps around the west sides of building pads #1-6. At building pad #7, a small cut slope provides a terminus to the second retaining wall. The third retaining wall picks up on the west side of this small cut slope and extends southerly on the west side of building pads #7-9. The maximum height of the walls is 11'-6", which occurs on the west side of building pad #8.

### Access

An internal private roadway, 28 feet in width, would connect two points of offsite vehicular access located on Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive.

### Construction Schedule

The first stage of construction is the demolition of all of the existing structures on the project site, which include a two-story residence, shed and kennel. Next the site will be cleared on vegetation (with the exception of the trees to be retained). Then the site will be graded for building pads and access. Overall, construction is expected to take approximately 24 months to complete the project.

The staging for all construction equipment, materials, and construction-worker parking would be provided onsite.

### DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS REQUIRED

The City of Los Angeles (the City) is the lead agency for the proposed project. In order to construct the proposed project, the applicant is requesting approval of the following discretionary approvals from the City:

- Approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61553 to authorize a 37 unit residential condominium development;
- Change of zoning from the existing R1-1 Single Family Residential to (Q) RD6-Restricted Density Multiple Dwelling zone;
- A Specific Plan Exception to allow the encroachment into the protected viewshed of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway;
- A Specific Plan Height Exception for single-family units on upslope pads within 100 feet of Mulholland Drive to exceed 15 feet and to allow single-family units on upslope pads within 500 feet of Mulholland Drive to exceed 30 feet in height;
- Retaining Wall Adjustment to permit deviations from the retaining wall limitations.

The Initial Study serves as the environmental document for all discretionary actions associated with development of the proposed project. This Initial Study is also intended to cover all federal, state, regional and/or local government discretionary approvals that may be required to develop the proposed project, whether or not they are explicitly listed below. Federal, state, and regional agencies that may have jurisdiction over the proposed project include, but are not limited to:

- Regional Water Quality Board; and
- South Coast Air Quality Management District.

## **RELATED PROJECTS**

Section 15063(b)(1) requires an Initial Study to consider whether there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the proposed project, either individually or cumulatively may cause a significant effect on the environment. Cumulative impacts are two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355).

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, cumulative impacts are anticipated impacts of the proposed project along with reasonably foreseeable growth. Reasonably foreseeable growth may be based on:

- A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or
- A summary of projections contained in the adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

For this Initial Study all proposed, recently approved, under construction, and reasonably foreseeable projects within a radius of approximately two and one-half miles that could produce a related or cumulative impact on the local environment when considered in conjunction with the proposed project were obtained from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), City of Calabasas, City of Hidden Hills, and Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and are evaluated in this Initial Study. The 24 related projects are listed in Table II-4 and their locations are depicted on Figure II-18. An analysis of the cumulative impacts associated with these related projects and the proposed project is provided in the cumulative impact discussion under each individual impact category in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Initial Study.

Cumulative impacts analyzed in the Initial Study were conservatively assessed. Some of the related projects may not be approved, and some approved projects may not be developed. In addition, many of

the related projects have been or will be subject to a variety of mitigation measures that will reduce the potential environmental impacts associated with those projects. However, with limited exceptions, those mitigation measures have not been taken into account in projecting the environmental impacts of the related projects. Therefore, the cumulative analyses set forth below are conservative and result in projecting greater impacts than is actually anticipated.

**Table II-4  
List of Related projects**

<i>Map No.</i>	<i>Size</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Location (Address)</i>
1	108,090	sf	Specialty retail	21347 Ventura Blvd.
2	3,500	sf	Fast-food restaurant w/ drive-through window	20952 Ventura Blvd.
3	141,000	sf	Automobile Dealership w/ repair service	20539 Ventura Blvd.
4	1,322,425	sf	Office	21261 Burbank Blvd.
5	879	du	Apartment	6200 De Soto Ave.
6	136	du	Apartment	6150 De Soto Ave.
7	563	du	Apartment	6250 De Soto Ave.
8	522	du	Apartment	6301 De Soto Ave.
9	421	du	Apartment	6355 De Soto Ave.
	(55,000)	sf	<i>Manufacturing to be removed</i>	
10	7,912	sf	Specialty retail	6750 De Soto Ave.
	3,413	sf	Fast-food restaurant w/ drive-through window	
11	522	du	Apartment	6628 Variel Ave.
12	210	du	Apartment	21050 Vanowen St.
	(39,100)	sf	<i>Office to be removed</i>	
13	300	sf	MTA park-and-ride lot	East side of Canoga Ave. (between Victory Blvd. & Vanowen Ave.)
14	600,000	Sf	Topanga mall expansion	6600 Topanga Canyon Blvd.
15	6,784	Sf	Restaurant	6355 Topanga Canyon Blvd.
	6,216	Sf	Restaurant	
	(10,394)	Sf	<i>Bank to be removed</i>	
16	181,082	Sf	Shopping center	22816 Victory Blvd.
17	200	St	Preschool/day care enrollment expansion	6221 Fallbrook Ave.
18	185	St	Private school enrollment expansion	22555 Oxnard St.
19	156	St	School expansion	5850 Fallbrook Ave.
20	110	Du	Apartment	24141 & 24121 Ventura Blvd.
21	8,700	Sf	Restaurant	23577 Calabasas Rd.
22	11,000	Sf	Office	24106 Calabasas Rd.
23	35,000	Sf	Office expansion	4500 Park Granada
24	65	St	Viewpoint school enrollment expansion	23620 Mulholland Hwy.
Source: Crain & Associates, November 2004				



**Figure II-18, Location of Related Projects**



**CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

**OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
ROOM 615, CITY HALL  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

**INITIAL STUDY  
AND CHECKLIST**

<b>LEAD CITY AGENCY</b> <i>City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning</i>	<b>COUNCIL DISTRICT</b> <i>CD-3</i>	<b>DATE</b> <i>August 10, 2005</i>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>		
<b>PROJECT TITLE/NO.</b> <i>Vesting Tentative Tract Map. 61553</i>		<b>CASE NO.</b>
<b>PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>DOES have significant changes from previous actions.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.</b>	
<p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b> <i>The proposed project is the subdivision of a 6.19-acre, irregularly shaped property into two lots and the subsequent development of 37 detached, single-family condominium homes. The homes would be two-stories, with a maximum height of 36-feet. Direct access site would be from a main entrance on Mulholland Drive and from a second entrance on San Feliciano Drive. A private onsite roadway would provide internal circulation and a connection between Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive. The private roadway would not be gated. No street lights are proposed on the private roadway. Each home would provide two covered parking spaces. Additionally, 19 onsite visitor parking spaces would be provided. The proposed project would also provide approximately 143,761 square feet of open space.</i></p> <p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:</b> <i>The project site is occupied by a vacant two-story single-family residence, sheds and a kennel. The remaining portion of land is undeveloped occupied by various trees (i.e., coast live oak, Southern California black walnut and Mexican fan palm), shrubs, low-lying weeds and grasses. The topography consists of a north-draining main canyon and a secondary canyon. A north-trending bedrock spur-ridge separates the main and easterly secondary canyon. Minor cut and fill grading techniques were employed to create level building sites for the structures. Past grading, associated with the construction of Mulholland Drive has consisted of placing fill where the roadway crosses the main and secondary canyons. The abandoned Girard Reservoir is adjacent to the north. There are 186 trees on the project site.</i></p> <p><b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b> <i>The project site is located in the Los Angeles City community of Woodland Hills, approximately 2 miles south of the Ventura Freeway (I-101), approximately 11 miles from the San Diego Freeway (I-405) and approximately 25 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles. The irregularly-shaped project site is bound by San Feliciano Drive to the north, Mulholland Drive to the south, Girard Reservoir to the east and single-family residences to the west. The street address is 22255 Mulholland Drive.</i></p>		
<b>PLANNING DISTRICT</b> <i>Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan</i>	<b>STATUS:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>PRELIMINARY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>PROPOSED</b> _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>ADOPTED</b>	
<b>EXISTING ZONING</b> <i>RI-1</i>	<b>MAX. DENSITY ZONING</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>DOES CONFORM TO PLAN</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO DISTRICT PLAN</b>
<b>PLANNED LAND USE &amp; ZONE</b> <i>(Q)RD-6</i>	<b>MAX DENSITY PLAN</b> <i>Low Density Residential (4-9 du/acre)</i>	
<b>SURROUNDING LAND USES</b>	<b>PROJECT DENSITY</b> <i>6 du/acre</i>	

---

---

 **DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency)**

---

**On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

---

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

---

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

---

I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

---

I find the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

---

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
NAME

---

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - 1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - 2) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - 3) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - 1) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - 2) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

---

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning             | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                       |  |

---

---

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)**

---

**BACKGROUND****PROPONENT NAME***DS Ventures***PHONE NUMBER***(323) 658-1511***PROPOSERS ADDRESSES***8383 Wilshire Blvd. #1000**Beverly Hills, CA 90211***AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST***City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning***DATE SUBMITTED****PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable)***Vesting Tentative Tract Map 61553*

---

---

---

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)

---

---

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) Through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

a. Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving :				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal result in:</b>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
amount of surface runoff in an manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?				
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, inquiry or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**XIV. RECREATION.**

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**XVI. UTILITIES.** Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION** (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

PREPARED BY	TITLE	TELEPHONE #	DATE
-------------	-------	-------------	------

---

---

## IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

---

### 1. AESTHETICS

#### a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse impact on a scenic vista. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

#### b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse aesthetic impact to scenic resources within a City-designated corridor. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

#### c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse impact on the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

#### d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Therefore, development of 37 single-family homes on the project site may have a significant adverse aesthetic impact due to increased light and glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

## Cumulative Impacts

**Potentially Significant Impact.** There are 27 related projects in the vicinity of the project site (see Table II-4). Development of the proposed project in conjunction with these related projects would result in an intensification of land uses in a suburban portion of the City. Many of the related projects would be visible from public and private properties. However, none of the related projects is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan and none would combine with the proposed project to affect cumulatively scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character or quality, or light and glare conditions of the Scenic Parkway. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

## 2. AGRICULTURE

- a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Protection, lists Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance under the general category of "Important Farmland." The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the project site is not included in the Important Farmland category.<sup>1</sup> The project site is located in a developed portion of Woodland Hills and does not include any state-designated agricultural lands. No impact on farmland or agricultural resources would occur.

- b) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract. Neither the project site nor any adjacent properties are zoned for agricultural uses and there are no Williamson Act contracts in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 1998, Map.

- c) **Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in the conversion of farmland to another, non-agricultural, use. Neither the project site nor any nearby properties are currently utilized for agricultural activities and, as discussed above (Section 2(a)), the site is not classified in any “Farmland” category designated by the State of California. No impact related to the conversion of Farmland would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project in combination with the related projects would not result in the conversion of State-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to a non-agricultural use. The Extent of Important Farmland Map Coverage maintained by the Division of Land Protection indicates that the project site and the surrounding area are not included in the Important Farmland category.<sup>2</sup> The project site and the related project sites are located in an urbanized area in the City and do not include any State-designated agricultural lands. Therefore, no cumulative impact would occur.

### **3. AIR QUALITY**

- a) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The project area is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). As such, it is also subject to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) prepared by the SCAQMD in 2003. Projects that are considered to be consistent with AQMP growth projections should not interfere with attainment and should not contribute to the exceedance of an existing federal or state air quality standard because such growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended thresholds at the project level. The AQMP control strategy is based on projections from local general plans and population growth projections identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG). The AQMP also assumes that general development projects will implement strategies (mitigation measures) to reduce emissions during construction and operation phases of

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

development. For this reason, projects that are consistent with local general plans are considered consistent with air quality related regional plans, such as the AQMP. The AQMP is based on the designated land use for the project site contained in the Los Angeles City General Plan. To the extent that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, it is, by inference, also consistent with the AQMP.

The General Plan land use designation (per the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan, which is part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan) for the project site is Low Density Residential. Although the project applicant is requesting a change of zoning from R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) to RD-6 (Restricted Density Multiple Dwellings) the resulting project would have less density than permitted by the proposed zoning: the RD-6 zone requires 6,000 square feet of land area per unit (LAMC 12.09.1 B4). Lot 1 has 206,902 sq. ft. allowing 34 units maximum; 32 are proposed. Lot 2 has 62,954 sq. ft. allowing 10 units; 5 are proposed. The Community Plan category is Low Density Residential reflecting an anticipated population of 4-9 du/net acre with a midpoint of 6.5 units per acre (Refer to page III-2 of the Community Plan). Both the Summary of Land Use Table (End of Section III) and the General Plan Land Use Map show that Low Density category permits RD-6 uses. Therefore, the 37 units proposed on the subject property are consistent with the density anticipated in the General Plan and is less than permitted by the General Plan and proposed zoning of the property.

Based on the above, the proposed project is considered to be consistent with the AQMP, and would not jeopardize attainment of air quality standards. Such consistency implies that the project will not create any unanticipated regional air quality impacts because such impacts have already been incorporated within the framework of the regional air quality planning process. As a result, impacts under this category are considered to be less than significant. However, the EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including any conflict with or obstruction of the applicable air quality plan, and any required mitigation measures.

**b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Demolition, grading and construction of the project site would result in the creation of a variety of air pollutant emissions, such as fugitive dust, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. Such emissions may exceed the air quality standards established by the SCAQMD. During operation of the project, regional emissions would be generated by mobile and stationary sources. Mobile emissions (e.g., carbon monoxide) would occur as a result of project-related motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Stationary source emissions would occur indirectly as a result of space and water heating systems, and various appliances. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the

project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including the quantification of air pollutant emissions created by the grading, construction and operational phases of the project, identification of applicable regulations, and any required mitigation measures.

- c) **Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative threshold for ozone precursors)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Under procedures set forth in the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, significance thresholds have been established for criteria pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as non-attainment. These criteria pollutants are: Carbon Monoxide (CO); Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>); Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC); and Particulate Matter – Fugitive Dust (PM<sub>10</sub>). Demolition, grading and construction of the project site would result in the creation of a variety of air pollutant emissions, such as fugitive dust, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the project's potential to result in air quality impacts, including the quantification of air pollutant emissions created by the grading and construction phases of the project, identification of applicable regulations, and any required mitigation measures.

- d) **Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The SCAQMD protocol utilizes localized CO concentrations to determine pollutant concentration potential. This criteria pollutant is the most likely to concentrate locally and cause health impacts, and is the only criteria pollutant for which an accepted methodology for calculating and assessing impacts of local concentrations has been developed. Activities such as demolition, grading and construction of the project site would have the potential to result in generation of CO emissions. CO emissions could be associated with truck traffic and equipment operation. The EIR will provide analyses to assess the project's emission levels associated with such activities, and the relationship of projected CO concentrations to applicable state and federal CO standards, including the identification of any required mitigation measures.

- e) **Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is the development of 37 single-family homes on the project site. Odors are typically associated with food related activities and industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. As the proposed project involves no elements related to these types of uses, no significant odors are anticipated. Consequently, no impact would occur.

## Cumulative Impacts

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Based on SCAQMD guidelines, cumulative air quality impacts are not analyzed in a manner similar to operational air quality impacts. Cumulative methods are different than the methodology used throughout the remainder of this Initial Study in which all-foreseeable future development within a given service boundary or geographical area is predicted and quantified. Instead, the SCAQMD's recommends that cumulative air quality analysis methods be based on performance standards and emission reduction targets necessary to attain the Federal and State air quality standards identified in the AQMP, which was established to attain future air quality standards. If an individual project is consistent with the AQMP performance standards, the project's cumulative impact should be considered less than significant. Based on the analysis provided earlier in the additional air quality analysis section, the proposed project is consistent with the AQMP and consequently, would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact.

## 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site has been largely disturbed by residential development and ornamental landscaping. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by residential development, an abandoned reservoir, a private school, and commercial uses. Because of the extent of onsite disturbance and surrounding development, there would be less potential for sensitive species to occur on the project site, compared to less disturbed sites of comparable area. However, the project site is in close proximity to large expanses of relatively undisturbed open space located to the south of Mulholland Drive, and the California Natural Diversity Data Base<sup>3</sup> lists three sensitive wildlife species, five sensitive plant species, and two sensitive plant communities for the Canoga Park USGS Topographic Quad Sheet, where the project site is located. Therefore, there is the potential that sensitive species and/or plant communities could occur on the project site. Consequently, project impacts are potentially significant and will be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

Oak and black walnut trees are considered to be protected trees by the City of Los Angeles, and they occur on the project. Impacts to oak and black walnut trees are discussed in Section 4 (e), below.

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/html/quick\\_viewer\\_launch.html](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/html/quick_viewer_launch.html)

- b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur where riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified locally, regionally, or by the state and federal regulatory agencies cited were to be adversely modified without adequate mitigation. The project site has experienced modest development in the past and is located within a developed residential and commercial area of Woodland Hills. There is no riparian habitat but there is oak woodland on the project site, which is a sensitive habitat area. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive natural communities. This issue is to be fully discussed in the EIR.

- c) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur where federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be modified or removed without adequate mitigation. Observations during an on-site investigation identified no surface water features or vegetation indicative of wetland areas (i.e., cattails and sedges) on the project site or adjacent properties.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the project site would not be expected to support any riparian or wetland habitat, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (see Section 4(b), above) and no project impacts to riparian or wetland habitats would occur.

- d) **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would interfere or remove access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project site is located in a developed portion of Hills and has been previously disturbed by residential development. No wildlife corridors are known to be located onsite and none would be expected, given the substantial extent of residential and institutional development surrounding the project site. Therefore, no project impacts to fish or wildlife corridors would be anticipated.

---

<sup>4</sup> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by EMG, November 13, 2003.

- e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

The following analysis is based upon the Horticultural Tree Report prepared by Trees, etc., dated April 19, 2004, which is attached (see Appendix A) and incorporated here by reference.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the proposed project would cause an impact which is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. Local ordinances protecting biological resources are limited to the City of Los Angeles Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance. The Horticultural Tree Report evaluated 186 trees onsite and adjacent to the project site, of which 30 would be removed for development of the proposed project. The remaining trees located on the 6.19-acre project site would remain undisturbed. Of the 30 trees to be removed, 24 are ornamental trees that are common and in various stages of health and vigor. The remaining six trees to be removed are coast live oaks (*Quercus agriflora*) (all over eight inches in diameter) located on the southwest portion of the project site. The City of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance (153,478) states that any Oak Tree measuring eight inches in diameter or more as measured from four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree must be protected. Consequently, project impacts are potentially significant and will be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

- f) **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur where a project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the types cited. The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. No project impacts to any adopted habitat or conservation plans would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less than Significant Impact.** None of the related projects is located close enough to combine with the proposed project to create cumulative impacts to biological resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be expected to be less than significant.

### **5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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. Both are incorporated here by reference and attached to this Initial Study in Appendix B.

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as: (1) a resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; (2) a resource listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting certain state guidelines; or (3) an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military or cultural annals of California, provided that the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the proposed project would adversely affect an historical resource meeting one of these definitions.

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 proposed project site.<sup>5</sup> According to the Phase I Archaeological Survey, no historical structures or features were shown for the project site on the 1947 USGS Calabasas topographical quadrangle, and very little development had occurred within the general vicinity by 1947. The existing structures on the site include two-story residence, sheds, and kennel. These structures lack the physical integrity required for listing in the National and California Registers. Therefore, no project impacts to historical resources would occur.

b) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is located in a developed area and has experienced modest development. According to the Phase I Archaeological Survey prepared by W & S Consultants, November 30, 2004, an archival records search, a review of existing published and unpublished reference on local prehistory and history, and an on-foot, intensive survey of the project site did not result in the discovery of any evidence of archaeological resources of any kind on the project site. Therefore, development of the proposed project does not have the potential to result in adverse impacts to known cultural resources. However, portions of the study area were found to be covered with imported fill. The inability to inspect this portion of the site, combined with the close proximity of the well-

<sup>5</sup> Letter correspondence, Thomas Shackford, Staff Researcher, South Coast Central Coastal Information Center, July 22, 2004 (Appendix C).

known archaeological site CA-LAN-246, makes the project site archaeologically sensitive. While project impacts to archaeological resources are expected to be less than significant, listed below are several Conditions of Approval which may be required by the City of Los Angeles to prevent substantial adverse changes in the significance of any archaeological resources in the event that any are discovered during site preparation and project construction.

#### Conditions of Approval

- 5-1. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the project developer to monitor topsoil grading, to ensure that any buried archaeological deposit is not inadvertently disturbed without treatment.
- 5-2. In the event that subsurface archaeological resources/human remains are encountered during the course of grading and/or excavation, all development shall temporarily cease in these areas until the archaeological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that human remains are discovered, there shall be no disposition of such human remains, other than in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. These code provisions require notification of the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission, who in turn must notify those persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American for appropriate disposition of the remains. Excavation or disturbance may continue in other areas of the project site that are not reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains or archaeological resources.
- 5-3. Copies of a subsequent archeological study or report, detailing the nature of any archaeological discovery, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any accessioned remains shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton.

**c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

A Paleontologic resource evaluation prepared by Paleo Environmental Associates, dated October 12, 2004, and a Paleontological records search at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County dated July 23, 2004 were compiled for the proposed project. Both are incorporated here by reference and attached to this Initial Study in Appendix C.

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** According to the Paleontologic Resource Evaluation, the project site is underlain (in ascending stratigraphic order) by two Cenozoic stratigraphic rock

units; an unnamed later Miocene marine shale (which underlies the hill in the southeastern portion of the site) and Holocene younger alluvium (which underlies the remaining, lower flat-lying portion of the site). According to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department, the potential for these rock units to yield fossil remains would be high within the marine shale, moderate within the alluvium at depth, and low within the alluvium near the surface. Thus, excavations during construction in the uppermost soil and younger alluvium layers are unlikely to uncover significant vertebrate fossils, however, any excavations of underlying older marine shale layers may well encounter important fossil vertebrate remains.<sup>6</sup> Because grading activities conducted within the marine shale could encounter paleontologic remains, several Conditions of Approval are listed below which should be required by the City of Los Angeles to prevent substantial adverse changes in the significance of paleontological resources in the event that any are discovered during site preparation and project construction. With implementation of these Conditions of Approval, project impacts to paleontological remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

#### Conditions of Approval

- 5-4 Prior to construction, the services of a qualified vertebrate paleontologist approved by the Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department (LACM) and the City of Los Angeles shall be retained to implement a mitigation program during earth-moving activities associated with development of the parcel.
- 5-5 The paleontologist shall develop a formal agreement with a recognized museum repository, such as the LACM, regarding the final disposition and permanent storage and maintenance of any fossil remains, as well as the archiving of associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, that might be recovered as a result of the mitigation program, and the level of treatment (preparation, identification, curation, cataloguing) of the remains that would be required before the entire mitigation program fossil collection would be accepted by the repository for storage.
- 5-6 Earth-moving activities (particularly grading and trenching for pipelines) shall be monitored by a paleontologic construction monitor. Monitoring shall include the inspection of fresh exposures created by grading of the unnamed marine shale and in the younger alluvium to allow for the recovery of larger fossil remains. Monitoring will be conducted on a full-time basis in areas underlain by the marine shale, and a half-time basis once trenching has reached a depth 5 feet below previous grade in areas underlain by younger alluvium. As soon as practicable, the monitor shall recover all vertebrate fossil specimens, a representative sample of invertebrate or plant fossils, or any fossiliferous rock or sediment sample that can be recovered easily. As warranted,

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

fossiliferous sediment samples shall be recovered from the younger alluvium and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains (total weight of samples will not exceed 6,000 pounds). The location and proper geologic context of any fossil occurrence or sampling site shall be documented, as necessary. The monitor shall have the authority to divert grading temporarily around a fossil site until the fossil remains have been evaluated and, if warranted, the remains and/or a fossiliferous rock or sediment sample have been recovered.

5-7 All fossil specimens recovered from the parcel as a result of the mitigation program, including those recovered as the result of processing fossiliferous sediment samples, will be treated (prepared, identified, curated, catalogued) in accordance with designated museum repository requirements. As appropriate, a sample of the marine shale will be submitted to a commercial laboratory for microfossil analysis; a sample of fossilized bone, shell, or wood from the younger alluvium will be submitted for carbon-14 dating analysis; and/or a sample of the alluvium will be submitted for pollen analysis.

5-8 The monitor shall maintain daily monitoring logs that include the location where monitoring was conducted, the rock unit encountered, fossil specimens or samples recovered, and associated specimen or sample data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data. A final technical report of findings summarizing the results of the mitigation program shall be prepared by the paleontologist. The report shall be prepared in accordance with SVP and museum repository requirements.

**d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb previously interred human remains. While there is no evidence that human remains are located on the project site, there is still a remote possibility that the construction phase of the proposed project could encounter human remains, which in turn could result in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of the Conditions of Approval listed above in 5(b) would reduce impacts to human remains to a less than significant level.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with other nearby related projects (see Table II-4) would result in an increase of existing localized land uses in an already urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. With mitigation the proposed project's impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with regard to

historic, archaeological, and paleontological, as well as human remains. While it is unknown as to whether any of the related projects would, on their own, result in significant impacts upon cultural resources, those projects within the city of Los Angeles can be expected to implement comparable mitigation measures as the proposed project. The Cities of Calabasas and Hidden Hills as well as the County of Los Angeles also have stringent requirements for mitigating impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, cumulative cultural resource impacts related to the development of the proposed project would be expected to be reduced to less than significant levels.

## 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

### a) **Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

The following analysis is based upon the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration, Proposed 37 Unit Residential Development, Tentative Tract 61553, Portion of Lot 1083, Tract 1000, 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, California for DS Ventures, LLC, March 22, 2005 prepared by The J. Byer Group, Inc., September 24, 2003, respectively. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix D.

- (i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project site is located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone, and appropriate building practices are not employed.

According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration report, there are no known active faults with close vicinity of the project site. None of the City-designated Fault Rupture Study Zones or State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones cross the project site.<sup>7</sup> The closest Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone or Fault Rupture Study Area to the Project Site, according to City mapping, is located approximately 4.25 miles north of the project site. Thus, impacts due to onsite rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones and Fault Rupture Study Areas in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, September 1, 1996.*

**(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the southern California region.

As with all properties in the seismically active Southern California region, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during seismic events produced by local faults. While it is likely that the project site will be shaken by future earthquakes produced in southern California, modern, well-constructed buildings are designed to resist ground shaking through the use of shear panels and reinforcement.

While the understanding of seismic activity grows over time, and additional faults are discovered, the site currently is not included in a City-designated Fault Rupture Study Zones or State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (see Section VI (a) i, above). Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are present throughout Southern California and would not be higher at the project site than for most of the City of Los Angeles or elsewhere in the region. Also, the City of Los Angeles Building Code, revised since the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, contains construction requirements to assure habitable structures are built to a level of acceptable seismic risk. With the project's construction in accordance with the code requirements, the risks from seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

**(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and mitigation measures required within such designated areas are not incorporated into the project. According to the Geologic and Soils Engineering Exploration Report prepared by the J. Byer Group, Inc., groundwater was encountered during onsite explorations at depths which ranged from 16 to 23 feet. However, the historic groundwater for this area of Woodland Hills is not indicated by the California Geological Survey.

The project site is underlain by fill, natural alluvium and bedrock. The alluvium consists of mixtures of silty sand, clayey sand and sand that is mottled brown, brownish gray, moist to saturated and slightly dense to very dense. The bedrock consists of (consisting of siltstone, sandstone and claystone). According to the Geological and Soil Engineering Exploration Report prepared by the J. Byer Group, Inc., numerous layers within the alluvium are subject to liquefaction. The liquefaction potential across the project site is variable because of the inter-fingering nature of the clayey and sandy alluvium. The highest liquefaction potential is located near the center of the project site. However, the Geological and Soil Engineering Exploration

Report indicates that the proposed project is feasible from a geologic and soils engineering standpoint provided the recommendations for remedial grading and construction are implemented during constructions. Other than compliance with the Building Code and the City's specific requirements, no further mitigation would be necessary.

**(iv) Landslides?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if a project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding. The project site is not in a landslide inventory area.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, no impact from seismically induced landslides would be expected.

**b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project exposes large areas to the erosional effects of wind or water for a protracted period of time. Development of the project site would include the demolition of the existing two-story residence, sheds and kennel, to be replaced with 37 detached condominiums. During construction, grading would expose approximately 2.75 acres of soil for a limited time, allowing for possible erosion, although the amounts would not be expected to be substantial.

Although project development has the potential to result in minor erosion of soils during site preparation and construction activities, erosion would be minimized by implementation of standard City required erosion controls imposed during grading and via building permit regulations. For example, all grading permits from the Department of Building and Safety include provisions to limit the erosion potential. Specifically, grading and site preparation must comply with all applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code which addresses grading, excavations, and fills. With implementation of the applicable grading and building permit requirements and the application of Best Management Practices, no significant impacts would occur related to erosion or loss of topsoil.

**c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Potential impacts with regard

---

<sup>8</sup> City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, *Navigate LA*, website: <http://navigatela.lacity.org/index01.htm>, July 28, 2004.

to liquefaction and landslide potential are evaluated in Sections 6(a) iii and iv, above. Construction must comply with the conditions of approval listed in Section 6(a) ii and iii, including building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. A less-than-significant impact is anticipated for the proposed project.

**d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, subsurface materials at the project site consist of natural alluvium that is made up of silty sand, clayey sand, and sand that is mottled brown, brownish gray, moist to saturated, and slightly dense to dense. Soft to slightly dense areas within the alluvium are also located at or near the groundwater level, which lies between 16 and 23 feet below the surface (fbs). These earth materials have some expansion potential, which would be adequately addressed by the foundation recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report. The potential for unsuitable soils to create settlement problems for structures, roads, and utility lines through vertical or lateral movement would be eliminated through soils re-engineering (i.e., remediation) during excavation and construction. As part of the construction permitting process, the City requires completed reports of soil conditions at construction sites to identify, and recommend treatment for, potentially unsuitable soil conditions. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil conditions would be considered less than significant.

**e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were located in an area not served by an existing sewer system. The proposed project site is located in a developed area of the City of Los Angeles, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment system operated by the City of Los Angeles. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of the related projects identified in Table II-4 would result in the intensification of residential and commercial development in a seismically-active region. Even though a mixture of clayey and sandy alluvium soils underlay the project site, development would be required to

comply with the City of Los Angeles Building Code and cumulative development would, therefore, be less than significant. Due to compliance with the California Building Code as well as identified conditions of approval, the proposed project's geotechnical impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### a) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project involves use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors. Uses sensitive to hazardous emissions (i.e., sensitive receptors) in the area consist of the single-family residential uses located to the north, south, west and east of the project site and the Louisville High School and Convent to the south of the project site. Other than typical cleaning solvents used for residential purposes, no hazardous materials would be used, transported, or disposed of in conjunction with the routine day-to-day operations of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

### b) **Would the project create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project utilizes substantial quantities of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and could potentially pose a hazard to nearby sensitive receptors under accident or upset conditions. A high-pressure gas line currently runs adjacent to the project site on the northwest side of Mulholland Drive. This gas line is partially exposed. Construction of the proposed project could pose a potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials related to this pipeline. This impact would be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be fully analyzed in the EIR.

### c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if a project site is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and has the potential to emit hazardous emissions. The nearest school, Louisville High School, is approximately 206 feet to the south of the project site. As stated in 7 (b), above, construction of the proposed project could pose a potential for accident conditions involving the release of

hazardous materials related to the high-pressure gas pipeline. This impact would be considered potentially significant, and this issue will be fully analyzed in the EIR.

- d) **Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

The following analysis is based upon the Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment- Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364 prepared by California Environmental Geologists & Engineers Inc. ("California Environmental"), August 2003. A copy of this report can be found in Appendix E.

**No Impact.** California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires various state agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. A significant impact may occur if a project site is included on any of the above lists and poses an environmental hazard to surrounding sensitive uses.

#### *Regulatory Database Review*

California Environmental reviewed the EDR Radius Map (regulatory database) report prepared by Environmental Data Resources, Incorporated (EDR), dated July 28, 2003. A summary of the federal and state agency database findings presented in the Phase I ESA is presented in Table IV-1. In addition, California Environmental also reviewed the 26 unmappable "Orphan" sites in the database report, cross-referencing addresses and site names. Unmappable sites are environmental risk sites that cannot be plotted with confidence, but can be located by zip code or city name. In general, such sites cannot be geo-coded because of inaccurate or missing location information in the record provided by the agency. Identified unmappable sites within the specified search radii are included in Table IV-1 below.

**Table IV-1  
Regulatory Database Results**

Regulatory Database	Approx Minimum Search Distance	Property Listed	No. of Area Sites Listed
Federal RCRIS-SQG	¼ mile	No	5
Federal ERNS list	¼ mile	No	1
Federal FINDS	½ mile	No	5
State UST	¼ mile	No	1
State CLEANERS	¼ mile	No	2
CA SLIC	½ mile	No	1

California Hazardous Waste Information System (HAZNET)	½ mile	No	25
LA County HMS	¼ mile	No	14
LA County Site Mitigation List	½ mile	No	1
WMUDS/SWAT	½ mile	No	3
Cortese	0.2 mile	No	1
CHMIRS	0.2 mile	No	2
CA WDS	XXX	No	2
<i>Source: Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, CA 91364 prepared by California Environmental, August 2003</i>			

Based on review of the regulatory database report, and by cross-referencing name, address, and zip code, California Environmental concluded that the project site is not a listed site. In addition, the project site is not listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances List (CORTESE). Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** A significant project-related impact may occur if a project were placed within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and subject to a safety hazard. The nearest airports are the Van Nuys and Burbank Airports which are located within approximately 10.65 to 20.5 miles to the northeast of the project site respectively. Furthermore, the project site is not in the vicinity of an airport land use plan.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, no impact would occur.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

- g) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

<sup>9</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, Zone Information and Map Access System, website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, July 28, 2004.

or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan. Short-term construction activities of the proposed project could result in temporary lane closures; but would not substantially impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (e.g., no existing street patterns would be changed). In addition, project impacts to area traffic would have no significant impacts on nearby roadways or intersection operations that might result in the interference with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (See Section 15, below). No impact would occur.

**h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire. The proposed project site is located in a mountain fire district and a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>10</sup> VHFHSZs are areas designated by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department pursuant to Government Code 51178 that were identified and recommended to local agencies by the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection based on criteria that includes fuel loading, slope, fire weather, and other relevant factors. These areas must comply with the Brush Clearance Requirements of the Fire Code.<sup>11</sup>

The project site consists mostly of level or gently sloping terrain and has good access from both Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by suburban development and is not immediately adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, there are no severe site limitations that would restrict access for fire fighting equipment. Furthermore, water mains are available adjacent to the site. Also, while the project site is located beyond the recommended 1.5 mile response distance from the nearest fire station, the requirement to provide automatic fire sprinkler systems would mitigate this concern (see Section XII (a)). Taken together, these considerations suggest that the project would not expose people or structures to a greater than average risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, impacts with respect to wildfires would be less than significant.

---

<sup>10</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, *Zone Information and Map Access System*, website: <http://zimas.lacity.org/>, July 20, 2004.

<sup>11</sup> *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Brush Fire Hazard Areas and Select Wildfire Hazard Areas*, Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, September 1, 1996.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. None of the related projects are industrial or involve other related uses that typically use, store, transport or treat hazardous materials. Rather, the related projects would be expected to utilize common household products that, while potentially hazardous, have typically been approved as safe by the State of California when used according to instructions. Thus, cumulative impacts related to risk of upset from release of hazardous materials would be expected to be less than significant. Only one related project (#24) is similarly located in close proximity to wildland areas that may combine with the proposed project to create cumulative wildfire hazards. All the other related projects are located in more developed areas and would not be expected to be subject to wildland fires. Both the proposed project and related project #24 would mitigate their individual impacts by compliance with standard Fire Department requirements; therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be anticipated.

## **8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

### **a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project discharges water which does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts.

Environmental impacts may result from the development of the proposed project. However, the potential impacts would be mitigated to a level of less than significant through incorporation of stormwater pollution control measures. Ordinance No. 172,176 and Ordinance No. 173,494 specify Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control, which requires the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code addresses grading, excavations, and fills. Applicants must meet the requirements of the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) as approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Thus, with incorporation of BMPs, the proposed project would result in a less than significant water quality impact.

- b) **Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes deep excavations resulting in the potential to interfere with groundwater movement or included withdrawal of groundwater or paving of existing permeable surfaces important to groundwater recharge. Currently, the project site consists primarily of permeable surfaces; however, the site is not designated for groundwater recharge. The proposed project does not involve any ground water extraction for wells or dewatering for subterranean construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies, and no impact would occur.

- c) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that would result in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project. The project site is located in a primarily suburbanized area, and no stream or river courses are located in the immediate project vicinity. Currently, the existing unimproved project site drains northeasterly into the abandoned Department of Water and Power Girard Reservoir, which carries off-site drainage into the San Feliciano storm drain. The proposed project would result in an improved site that would convey runoff via streets into the storm drains that border the tract to the west and along Feliciano. Thus, the runoff from the project site would end up in the same storm drain system, and no erosion or siltation impact associated with the alteration of existing drainage patterns would occur.

- d) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project results in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties. Currently, the existing unimproved project site drains northeasterly into the abandoned Department of Water and Power Girard Reservoir, which carries off-site drainage into the San Feliciano storm drain. The proposed project would result in an improved site that would convey runoff via streets into the storm drains that border the

tract to the west and along Feliciano. Thus, the runoff from the project site would end up in the same storm drain system, and no flooding impact associated with the alteration of existing drainage patterns would occur.

- e) **Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would increase the volume of storm water runoff to a level that exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A project-related significant adverse effect would also occur if a project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Runoff from the project site would be collected via streets and would be directed to the San Feliciano storm drain. Development of the proposed project would result in 35.6 percent coverage of the site by impervious surfaces (e.g., structures and paved surfaces). With additional impervious surfaces, there would be a 5.2 cubic feet per second (cfs) net increase in runoff with development of the site. As these impervious surfaces would be exposed to the elements, minimal amounts of polluted runoff could also be created. However, the San Feliciano storm drain would accept the incremental increase in runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase stormwater runoff from the project site above existing levels or provide additional sources of polluted runoff to the storm drain system. This impact would be considered less than significant.

- f) **Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. Other than the sources discussed above under 7(e), the proposed project would not include other potential sources of contaminants which could potentially degrade water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

- g) **Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were placing housing in a 100-year flood zone. The proposed project would involve the development of housing, but

the project site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.<sup>12</sup> Further, according to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 0601370041C, the project site is located within Zone C, which includes areas of minimal flooding. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone, which would impede or redirect flood flows. As mentioned in 8(g), the project site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.<sup>13</sup> The proposed project is located in a suburbanized area and would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**i) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exposed people or structures to a significant risk of loss or death caused by a seiche (a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken) or inundation (caused by a water storage facility failure). The project does not lie in a potential inundation area or a potentially affected-by-tsunami area.<sup>14</sup> The Girard Reservoir is located northeast and adjacent to the project site, however, the reservoir has been drained since 1989.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, flooding of the project site as a result of a break in the reservoir is unlikely. Flooding from other sources is also not expected (refer to Section 8 (g) and (h)). Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

**j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project site is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to be potentially at risk of the effects of seismically-induced tidal phenomena (seiche and tsunami) or if the project site is located adjacent to a

---

<sup>12</sup> Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, 100 Year and 500 year Flood Plains, September 1, 1996.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas, September 1, 1996.

<sup>15</sup> Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364.

hillside area with soil characteristics that would indicate potential susceptibility to mudslides or mudflows. The proposed project site is not located close to an ocean, as the Pacific Ocean lies approximately 8 miles south of the project site on the southern side of the Santa Monica Mountains. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the project site is located in a hilly area, however, the project site is primarily surrounded by urban development (including the improved Mulholland Drive to the south) and does not contain any potential source for mudflow. Therefore, the project site is not subject to a risk of flooding from inundation by seiche or tsunami or subject to significant risk involving mudflow. This impact would be considered less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would increase the amount of impervious area and runoff; however, landform and drainage alteration would be limited as the cumulative projects would be directing drainage via improved streets to the same storm drainage systems that currently collect drainage from these sites. In addition, none of the related projects are located in close proximity to the project site and would, therefore, not have the potential to combine with the proposed project to create cumulative hydrology impacts. As runoff from the proposed project flows into the San Feliciano storm drain system and would contribute incremental runoff to this system, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## **9. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

### **a) Would the project physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project were sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community (a typical example would be a project which involved a continuous right-of-way such as a roadway which would divide a community and impede access between parts of the community). The proposed development would not expand or modify the existing project site boundaries. Furthermore, no streets or sidewalks would be permanently closed as a result of the development. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the project. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community, and no impact is anticipated from project implementation.

- b) **Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Inner Corridor of the Mulholland Scenic Corridor Specific Plan area. There is the potential that the project would not be consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan. Consequently a discussion of the project's compatibility with the Specific Plan is required and will be provided in the EIR.

- c) **Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the project site were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No such plans presently exist which govern any portion of the project site. Furthermore, the project site is located in a suburban community. Therefore the proposed project would not conflict with such plans.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the conversion of vacant land and low-density uses or the conversion of existing land use (e.g., from commercial to residential). It could be possible that cumulative impacts on land use compatibility might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to specific issues associated with these projects or their locations. These cumulative issues will be discussed in the EIR.

### **10. MINERAL RESOURCES**

- a) **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally-important mineral resource and the project converted an existing or potential future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for regionally-important mineral resource

extraction. No oil extraction or mineral extraction activities have historically occurred or are presently conducted on the project site.<sup>16</sup> No adverse project impacts would occur.

**b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource extraction and the project converted an existing or potential future locally-important mineral extraction use to another use or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for locally-important mineral resource extraction. The City of Los Angeles has not designated a locally-significant resource on the site; thus no locally-designated resources would be affected.<sup>17</sup> No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development and redevelopment of sites that are not designated as mineral resource recovery sites by the City of Los Angeles. Due to an absence of oil and mineral extraction activities currently and historically at the project site as well as no City-designation of the project site as a locally-significant mineral resource, no cumulative mineral resource impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

**11. NOISE**

**a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project may generate short-term intermittent noise levels that could exceed standards set forth in the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Ordinance No. 144,331) and therefore are potentially significant. This issue is to be fully discussed in the Draft EIR.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment Phase I Residential Property 22241 and 22255 Mulholland Drive Los Angeles, CA 91364.*

<sup>17</sup> *Los Angeles City Planning Department Environmental and Public Facilities Maps, Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits, September 1, 1996.*

- b) **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The primary vibration sources associated with the development of the Project may include the use of heavy machinery and trucks during the construction of foundations. Pile drivers for example, create a high-intensity, repetitious noise that is disturbing and can result in ground vibrations. However, due to the proximity of residential uses to the project site (i.e., western boundary), and the school south of the site, it is possible construction activity could result in vibration above the normally acceptable threshold of 0.4 inches per second. Impacts are, therefore, considered to be potentially significant. This issue is to be discussed in the Draft EIR.

- c) **Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Any permanent changes in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity as a result of the proposed project would be due to project occupancy. Once the project is occupied, it is expected that noise generated by the proposed project would be similar to that generated by existing residential uses in the vicinity. Project development, while contributing to an overall increase in ambient noise levels in the project area, would result in land uses that are consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the project site. In addition the proposed project would have to result in the doubling of traffic to create a perceptible (three decibels) noise increase in ambient noise levels. Based on the project's traffic report, the project would result in a trip generation of 354 vehicles per day. This will not be enough to result in an increase of three decibels in ambient noise levels at the project level. Therefore, project-related operational noise impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- d) **Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As indicated under items 10(a) and (b) above, construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project area above levels existing without the proposed project. This issue is to be discussed in the Draft EIR.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if the project would introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the

project site during construction of the project. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to a project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No such facilities are located in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The continued development throughout the City of Los Angeles may result in intermittent, short term noise impacts throughout the region. Construction activities may result in potentially significant short-term noise impacts on sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the individual project sites. The duration of these localized impacts would be limited to the construction phases of the individual projects. All construction activities taking place within the City would be subject to the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

However, construction of the proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable impact in terms of substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. The nearest active construction site is an existing project located approximately 150 feet to the north of the proposed project site. Because this project is nearing completion, it is anticipated that no other projects would be located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that would have the potential to affect the same surrounding uses at the same time as does the proposed project. The same condition would apply to the exposure of people to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration in the vicinity of the project site during project construction. Because no other construction projects are located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that would have the potential to affect the same surrounding uses at the same time as does the proposed project, the contribution of the proposed project to any cumulative construction-related groundborne vibration impacts would not be considerable.

## 12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a) **Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a proposed project were to result in new development such as homes, businesses, roads, or infrastructure, with the effect of substantially inducing growth that would otherwise not have occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of 37 new single-family detached condominiums, which would include construction of private, gated roads and extension of existing utility lines throughout a planned community, but would not result in the development of any new businesses, public roads, or new infrastructure that would lend to additional future development in the area.

As part of its comprehensive planning process for the Southern California region, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has divided its jurisdiction into 13 subregions. The project site is located within the City of Los Angeles Subregion (“Subregion”), which includes all areas within the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles. For 2005, the Subregion has an estimated 4,032,474 population and 1,330,724 households (SCAG RTP Growth Forecast, 2004). By the year 2010, SCAG forecasts an increase to 4,176,079 persons (a 3.6 percent increase) and 1,393,635 households (a 4.7 percent increase) within the Subregion. By 2030, SCAG forecasts an increase to 4,413,425 persons (a 9.4 percent increase) and 1,663,002 households (a 5.0 percent increase) within the Subregion.

The project site is also considered part of the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills and West Hills Community Planning Area (“Planning Area”). For 2003, the Planning Area had an estimated total population of 169,692 persons and 62,042 housing units.

Utilizing a factor of 2.905 persons per household (CDF Estimates, 2002), the project can be expected to generate a total resident population of 108 persons with development of all 37 single-family detached condominiums. This represents an increase of 0.000027 percent from the 2005 estimated Subregion population, and an increase of 0.00064 percent from the 2003 estimated Planning Area total resident population. This would not represent substantial population growth within the Subregion nor the Planning Area and represents a less-than-significant impact. In addition, due to the strong demand for housing in the area, the increase in housing supply would actually be considered a beneficial impact.

- b) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The project site is currently developed with one unoccupied single-family residence. This residence will be demolished. The removal of this residence would not constitute the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing. Therefore, no project impact would occur.

- c) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** A project-related significant adverse affect could occur if the project would result in displacement of existing occupied housing units. There currently is one vacant residence on the project site. Therefore, no project impact would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in development of 3,400 housing units, which represents a 0.00245-percent population increase from the SCAG 2005 population estimates for the Los Angeles City Subregion. As this population growth remains within future SCAG projections for the City of Los Angeles Subregion, such cumulative growth would be less than significant. Due to an incremental project-related population increase (0.000027 percent) within the Subregion as well as the current need for housing within this area (identified as the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills and West Hills Community Planning Area), the proposed project's population and housing impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

### **13. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objective for any of the following public services:**

#### **Fire protection?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provides fire protection services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if the LAFD could not adequately serve a project based upon response time, access, or fire hydrant/water availability.

The LAFD considers fire protection services for a project adequate if a project site is within the maximum response distance for the land use proposed. Pursuant to Section 57.09.07A of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the maximum response distance between residential land uses and a LAFD fire station that houses an engine or truck company is 1.5 miles.<sup>18</sup> If this distance is exceeded, all structures located in the applicable residential area would be required to install automatic fire sprinkler systems. Thus, since the project site is approximately 2.2 miles driving distance from Fire Station No. 84, located at 5340 Canoga Avenue in Woodland Hills, the proposed development would be required to install sprinkler systems.

The required fire flow for the proposed low-density single-family residential development would be approximately 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm). In any instance, a minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch is to remain in the water system while the required gpm is flowing. Fire flow requirements and water pressure to meet fire flow and residual requirements are unknown at this time. However, prior to approval, the proposed project would submit a request to LADWP to determine whether the pressure in the project area is sufficient. If they are not, then upgrades to the existing infrastructure would be necessary. Overall, the proposed project would not generate the need, or cause the construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. Further, the project would be constructed according to California Fire Code requirements regarding length and width of roads and accesses as well as distance to and between fire hydrants. Impacts associated with fire protection services would be considered less than significant.

### **Police protection?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) provides law enforcement services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project creates the need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objective. The project site is located in the West Valley Area police service area and would be served by the West Valley Community Police Station, located at 19020 Vanowen Street in Reseda. The West Valley Area covers approximately 52 square miles and is served by approximately 350 sworn police officers. West Valley's 350 sworn officers patrol over 750 street miles and serve a population of almost 300,000 residents, in the areas of Reseda, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Encino, Tarzana, Sherman Oaks (part), Northridge (part), Winnetka, and Canoga Park.<sup>19</sup> Thus, the officer to resident ratio for the West Valley Area is one officer per 860 residents, and the proposed project's addition of 108 residents would not materially increase this officer to resident ratio in the West Valley Area.

---

<sup>18</sup> Los Angeles Fire Department, Station No. 84, website: <http://www.lafd.org/fs84.htm>, June 22, 2005.

Overall, the proposed project would not generate the need, or cause the construction of new or expanded law enforcement facilities. Impacts associated with law enforcement services would be considered less than significant.

### **Schools?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) provides school service for the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial population growth, which could generate demand for school facilities that exceeds the capacity of the school district responsible for serving the project site. The development of 37 single-family detached condominiums would increase the number of residents and, in turn, the number of school-aged children, that would require school services and could result in decreased school capacity or overcrowding of schools in the project area. However, as established in the State of California Government Code Section 65595, to mitigate school overcrowding within the LAUSD service area, developers are required to pay \$3.55 per square foot of new residential development. The required fee applies to all new development within the City of Los Angeles, including the proposed project, and is considered sufficient mitigation for any impacts.

### **Other public facilities?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles Public Library system provides library services to the project area. A significant impact may occur if a project generates a demand for other public services (such as libraries) that exceeds the capacity available. The development of 37 single-family detached condominiums would result in an incremental increase in the number of residents that would require minimal additional library services, but would not require the construction of new library facilities. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. Cumulative impacts on fire protection, law enforcement, school, and other public services might occur due to cumulatively increased residents and uses that would require these services, and such cumulative development could be significant. However, as the proposed project would result in an incremental 108 persons to the project

---

<sup>19</sup> Los Angeles Police Department, West Valley Community Police Station, website: [http://www.lapdonline.org/community/op\\_valley\\_bureau/west\\_valley/west\\_valley\\_home\\_frame.htm](http://www.lapdonline.org/community/op_valley_bureau/west_valley/west_valley_home_frame.htm), June 22, 2005.

area, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable related to demand for the aforementioned public services.

#### 14. RECREATION

- a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Approximately 108 new permanent residents would be generated as a result of the proposed project that would utilize the park and recreational facilities in the project area. According to the Community Plan, the existing parks satisfy the needs of the current residents, but the community is still deficient in the number of neighborhood parks. However, the proposed project, with its incremental population contribution, is not likely to substantially increase the rate of deterioration of park and recreational facilities in the area. Furthermore, the project developer would be required by the City of Los Angeles to pay into the City parks and recreation fund via payment of Quimby fees. Payment of such fees would constitute mitigation for potential impacts. Therefore, impacts upon maintenance of park and recreational facilities are considered less than significant.

- b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**No Impact.** No new recreation facilities are proposed as part of the project. Thus, no impact related to construction or expansion of such facilities would occur.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. Permanent population increase due to the development of 3,400 dwelling units would result in the need for new or expanded park and recreational facilities. However, cumulative development, like the proposed development, would be required by the City of Los Angeles to pay into the respective city parks and recreation fund via payment of Quimby fees, and payment of these fees would mitigate potential recreation impacts associated with cumulative development. Further, as the proposed project would result in an incremental 108 persons to the project area, development of the proposed project would not be considered cumulatively considerable related to demand for park and recreational facilities.

## 15. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The following analysis is based on the Traffic Analysis for Proposed Residential Development at 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, City of Los Angeles, dated November 2004 by Crain & Associates, which is included in Appendix F, and incorporated by reference.

- a) **Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number or vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** According to the Traffic Report, implementation of the proposed project would generate approximately 354 new vehicle trips per day, including an increase of 28 trips during the AM peak hour and 37 trips during the PM peak hour. The study intersections in the traffic report are:

- Dumetz Road and San Feliciano Drive
- Dumetz Road and Topanga Canyon Boulevard
- Mulholland Drive and San Feliciano Drive
- Mulholland Drive and Mulholland Highway
- Mulholland Drive and Topanga Canyon Boulevard

These intersections are near the project site and are those likely to be most directly impacted by project traffic. An increase in the Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) value (i.e. Volume/Capacity ratio), due to project-related traffic, of 0.010 or more when the final “with project” LOS is E or F; a CMA increase of 0.020 or more when the final LOS is D; or an increase of 0.040 or more at LOS C, would constitute a significant impact on the traffic load and capacity of the street system. As shown in Table IV-2 below, no intersection in either future condition would experience a CMA increase of more than 0.01 and, therefore, project traffic impacts would be less than significant.

**Table IV-2**

**Future (2007) Traffic Conditions With Project (Gated Access and Without Gated Access)**

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	With Project (Gated Access)			With Project (Without Gated Access)		
			CMA	LOS	Impact	CMA	LOS	Impact
1	Dumetz Rd. & San Feliciano Dr.	AM	0.605	B	0.004	0.605	B	0.004
		PM	0.489	A	0.006	0.489	A	0.006

2	Dumetz Rd. & Topanga Canyon Blvd.	AM	0.869	D	0.004	0.869	D	0.004
		PM	0.936	E	0.004	0.936	E	0.004
3	Mulholland Dr. & San Feliciano Dr.	AM	0.788	C	0.001	0.783	C	-0.004
		PM	0.702	C	0.004	0.693	B	-0.005
4	Mulholland Dr. & Mulholland Hwy.	AM	0.849	D	0.001	0.853	D	0.005
		PM	0.755	C	0.001	0.763	C	0.009
5	Mulholland Dr. & Topanga Canyon Blvd.	AM	0.819	D	0.004	0.819	D	0.004
		PM	0.837	D	0.003	0.837	D	0.003

*Source: Traffic Analysis For Proposed Residential Development at 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, City of Los Angeles, dated November 2004 by Crain & Associates.*

- b) **Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was enacted by the State Legislature following the passage of Proposition 111 in 1990 with the intent of providing the analytical basis for transportation decisions through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. A countywide approach has been established by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), the local CMP agency, designating a highway network that includes all state highways and principal arterials within the County and monitoring the network's LOS to implement the statutory requirements of the CMP. The monitoring of the CMP network is one of the responsibilities of local jurisdictions. If LOS standards deteriorate, then local jurisdictions must prepare a deficiency plan to be in conformance with the countywide plan. For purposes of the CMP analysis, a significant traffic impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by two percent of capacity, causing or worsening LOS F.

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 nearest arterial CMP monitoring station is located on Topanga Canyon Boulevard at Ventura Boulevard, approximately one and a half miles from the project site. A review of the project trip distribution and net project traffic additions to the study vicinity shows that the proposed project will not add 50 or more trips to this CMP intersection. At most, it is estimated that there would be 21 project trips during the AM peak hour and 28 project trips during the PM peak hour traversing this intersection. As these volumes are below the threshold of 50 trips, no further CMP intersection analysis is warranted.

According to the local CMP, any freeway segment where a project is expected to add 150 or more trips in any direction during the peak hours is also to be analyzed. For the proposed project, the maximum number of directional trips would be 23 total inbound trips during the PM peak hour. As the peak-hour trips expected to use the freeway network for project site access are less than the

freeway threshold of 150 directional trips, no significant project impact to any CMP monitoring location is forecast and no additional freeway analysis is necessary.

**c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** This question would apply to the proposed project only if it were an aviation-related use. The proposed project does not include any aviation-related uses. The proposed project would have no airport impact.

**d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would include a curvilinear private roadway within a planned community development, but this roadway, although curved, would not contain any sharp curves. Two new intersections would be created as a result of project implementation, however, posted street signs regarding right-of-way and speed limit would reduce hazards associated with the proposed intersections to a less-than-significant level.

**e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Vehicular access to the project area will be provided by the construction of a curvilinear private roadway which connects San Feliciano Drive at the northern part of the site with Mulholland Drive northeast of Mulholland Highway. Thus, with a primary access off of Mulholland Drive as well as a secondary access off of San Feliciano provided to the planned community development, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Further, the project would be constructed according to California Fire Code requirements regarding length and width of roads and accesses.

**f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The project would comply with the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Parking Regulation which requires single-family residences similar to those proposed for the project to provide two parking spaces per dwelling unit. These parking spaces will be designed as part of the private garages included for each dwelling unit. Vehicular access to the project area will be provided by the construction of a curvilinear private roadway which connects San Feliciano Drive at the northern part of the site with Mulholland Drive northeast of Mulholland Highway. Each home will have a garage with access to the driveway. In addition, 19 guest parking spaces, at 0.50 guest parking space per unit, would be provided on site. Consequently, impacts related to parking capacity will be less than significant.

- g) **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) is the primary service provider in the San Fernando Valley. Route 245 operated by the MTA is within fairly reasonable walking distance (approximately half a mile) from the project site. In addition, the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and the Santa Clarita Transit Authority (SCTA) operate commuter express routes throughout the Valley. The proposed project is not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there would be no impact to adopted policies or existing alternative transportation facilities.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. It could be possible that significant impacts related to transportation and traffic might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to additional traffic and increased parking demand, and such cumulative development could be significant. As the proposed project would contribute 37 dwelling units at most to the project area, the proposed project's transportation and traffic impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

### **16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

- a) **Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. This question would typically apply to properties served by private sewage disposal systems, such as septic tanks. Section 13260 of the California Water Code states that persons discharging or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewers system, shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) containing information which may be required by the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB then authorizes a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that ensures compliance with wastewater treatment and discharge requirements. The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the proposed project area.

The proposed project would convey wastewater via municipal sewage infrastructure maintained by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP is

a public facility, and, therefore, is subject to the State's wastewater treatment requirements. As such, wastewater from the project site is treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB, and no impact would occur.

**(b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded.

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) ensures the reliability and quality of its water supply through an extensive distribution system that includes more than 7,100 miles of pipes, more than 100 storage tanks and reservoirs within the City, and eight storage reservoirs along the Los Angeles Aqueducts.<sup>20</sup> Much of the water flows north to south, entering Los Angeles along the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) in Sylmar, which is owned and operated by LADWP. Water entering the LAAFP undergoes treatment and disinfection before being distributed throughout the LADWP's Water Service Area.<sup>21</sup> The LAAFP has a capacity to treat approximately 600 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently operating at 75 percent of its capacity. Therefore, the LAAFP has the ability to treat an additional 150 mgd of water per day.

As discussed in 16(d) below, the proposed project would consume approximately 10,656 gallons of water daily (or 0.011 mgd). Consequently, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to measurably reduce the LAAFP's capacity. Therefore, no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required. Consequently, with respect to water treatment facilities, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to water infrastructure, the residential development would entail extension of existing utilities that serve surrounding residential uses. If water main or infrastructure upgrades are required, the project developer would pay for such upgrades and a temporary disruption in service may occur, with proper notification to LADWP customers. In the event that water main and other infrastructure upgrades are required, it is not expected to create a significant impact to the physical environment because any disruption of service would be short-term in nature, replacement of the water mains would be within public rights-of-way, and

---

<sup>20</sup> *City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Central and Eastern Los Angeles Water Quality Annual Report, 2003.*

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

any foreseeable infrastructure improvements would be limited to the immediate project vicinity. Therefore, impacts resulting from water infrastructure improvements would be considered less than significant.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation provides sewer service to the project area. Sewage from the project site is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). Since 1987, the HTP has had capacity for full secondary treatment.<sup>22</sup> Currently the HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 mgd and has capacity to treat an average daily flow of 450 mgd.<sup>23</sup> As discussed under 16(e) below, the proposed project would generate 8,880 gallons (0.0089 mgd) of wastewater daily. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to measurably reduce the HTP's capacity. Therefore, no new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required. Consequently, with respect to wastewater treatment facilities, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to wastewater infrastructure, the residential development would entail extension of existing utilities that serve surrounding residential uses. The local sewer line should be able to accommodate the incremental additional flow from the proposed project. As such, no new or expanded wastewater infrastructure would be required to serve the project, and a less-than-significant impact would occur.

c) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the volume of stormwater runoff were to increase to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site. As discussed under 7(e), the proposed project would result in additional impervious surfaces and, thus, an additional 5.2 cubic feet per second (cfs) net increase in runoff. However, the San Feliciano storm drain would accept the incremental increase in runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase storm water runoff going to the storm water drainage system from the project site above existing levels. As storm water from the project site would not exceed the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems or require new or expanded storm water facilities, this impact would be considered less than significant.

---

<sup>22</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, website: <http://www.lacity.org/SAN/htp.htm>.

<sup>23</sup> City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Major Activities, website: <http://www.lacity.org/san/sanmact.htm>.

- d) **Would the project have significant water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase water consumption to such a degree that new water source would need to be identified, or that existing resources would be consumed at a pace greater than planned for by purveyors, distributors, and service providers. The LADWP is responsible for providing water services to the project site. The LADWP can generally supply water to developments within its service area, except under extraordinary circumstances. The City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework anticipates that the future water supply will be sufficient to meet existing and planned growth in the City to the year 2010. Generally speaking, to the extent a project is consistent with the underlying zoning and General Plan land use designations, its water demands have already been accounted for in the LADWP's Water Management Plan.

State Water Code Sections 10910 through 10915 state that any project with over 500 residential units, commercial businesses over 500,000 square feet of space and employing over 1,000 people or industrial businesses over 250,000 square feet and employing over 1,000 people are required to request a water availability assessment. Based on the size of the proposed project, a water availability assessment is not required. Nevertheless, utilizing 288 gallons/unit daily consumption rate<sup>24</sup>, the proposed project's anticipated water demands are estimated to be 10,656 gpd or 0.011 mgd. Therefore, sufficient domestic water supply should be supplied to the proposed project. Nevertheless, LADWP recommends that water should be conserved at all times. The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact upon water supplies.

- e) **Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project area would be exceeded. Utilizing 240 gallons/unit daily generation rate, the proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 8,880 gpd (or 0.0089 mgd) of wastewater. As discussed under 15(b), the current remaining capacity of the HTP is 88 mgd. Therefore, the HTP would have adequate capacity to treat the 0.0089 mgd of wastewater generated by the proposed project, in addition to existing commitments, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

---

<sup>24</sup> Source: Charles C. Holloway, Supervisor of Environmental Assessment, City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, November 19, 2004

- f) **Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacity would be insufficient to accommodate the additional solid waste. The project developer would contract with a private hauler of their choice for disposal of the commercial and residential waste.

Over 90 percent of the construction and residential solid waste generated in the City of Los Angeles is disposed of at the Sunshine Canyon Landfill in Sun Valley. The permitted daily intake (or capacity) of the landfill is 11,000 tons per day. As the landfill has an average daily intake of 5,781 tons per day, the remaining permitted daily intake is 5,219 tons per day. The estimated date of closure for the landfill is 2029.

Utilizing a daily solid waste generation rate of 12.23 pounds per unit, the proposed project would generate approximately 453 pounds or 0.23 tons of solid waste per day during operation. All solid-waste-generating activities within the City of Los Angeles, including the proposed project, would continue to be subject to the requirements set forth in California Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which requires each city and county to divert 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. Thus, the proposed project would divert 50 percent of its solid waste generated and dispose of 226 pounds or 0.11 tons of solid waste per day in the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. With a remaining daily intake of 5,219 tons per day, the landfill would have adequate capacity to accommodate the operational solid waste generated by the proposed project. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact associated with operation solid waste generation would occur.

- g) **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Solid waste generated at the project site by the proposed project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste, including AB 939. In addition, as analyzed under 15(d), the remaining daily intake of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill would be able to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed project, and no exemptions with respect to solid waste disposal would be needed nor are they required. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### Cumulative Impacts

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** Development of the proposed project in conjunction with development of related projects (see Table II-4) in the area would result in the development of residential and commercial uses. It could be possible that significant impacts related to utilities and service systems might occur with respect to one or more of the related projects due to additional demand and generation, and such cumulative development could be significant.

Cumulative development would result in an additional water supply demand of 1.01 mgd, an additional wastewater generation of 0.84 mgd, and an additional solid waste generation of 29.11 tons per day. As this cumulative water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation would not exceed the existing capacities of the LAAFP (150 mgd remaining daily capacity), HTP (88 mgd remaining daily capacity), or Sunshine Canyon Landfill (5,219 tons per day remaining daily capacity, respectively, impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

## 17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur only if a project would have an identified potentially significant impact for any of the above issues. The proposed project is located in a relatively developed area of the Santa Monica Mountains within the City of Los Angeles and, with incorporation of the conditions of approval mentioned in this Initial Study, would have no significant impacts with respect to cultural resources, but would have potentially significant impacts with regard to biological resources. Thus, biological resources will be analyzed within the EIR.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the project site would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. The past, current, and probable future projects in the Planning Area, as discussed under the

“Cumulative Impacts” subheadings throughout this Initial Study, coupled with the proposed project could potentially cause a cumulative impact. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards, land use, and noise will be analyzed within the EIR.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact may occur if a project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. As noted in the environmental analysis presented above, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts related to air quality, hazards, and noise. Thus, the proposed project would have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, and these issues will be analyzed within the EIR.

---

---

## V. PREPARERS OF INITIAL STUDY AND PERSONS CONSULTED

---

---

### Environmental Consultants

Christopher A. Joseph & Associates  
31255 Cedar Valley Drive, Suite 222  
Westlake Village, California, 91364  
(818) 735-8838

Marc Melinkoff  
Lynn Kaufman,  
Scott Wirtz,  
Kelsey Bennett  
Helen Crofoot

### Technical Subconsultants

#### Transportation/Circulation

Crain & Associates  
2007 Sawtelle Boulevard, Suite 4  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(310) 473-6508

#### Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

California Environmental Geologists & Engineers, Inc.  
1161 Calle Suerte, Suite G  
Camarillo, CA 93012

#### Geotechnical Engineering Study

The J.Byer Group, Inc.  
1461 E. Chevy Chase Dr. #200  
Glendale, CA 91206  
(818) 549-9959

Horticultural Tree Report

Trees, etc.

P.O. Box 4583

Thousand Oaks, CA 91359

Phase I Archaeology Survey

W & S Consultants

2242 Stinson Street

Simi Valley, California 93065

Paleontologic Resource Evaluation

Paleo Environmental Associates

2248 Winrock Avenue

Altadena, CA 91001

Land Use Consultant

Roger Van Wert

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory

515 South Figueroa, 7th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3398

Legal Counsel

R.J. Comer

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble & Mallory

515 South Figueroa, 7th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3398

CEQA Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles

Department of City Planning

750 South Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90013

(213) 977-1600

Project Applicant

DS Ventures, LLC  
8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1000  
Beverly Hills, CA 90211  
(323) 658-1511