

Direct Response to:
David Somers, Project Coordinator
Room 750. City Hall
Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-1343 (FAX)
David.Somers@lacity.org

EIR CASE NO: ENV-2005-2301-EIR

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2005111054

PROJECT NAME: Vesting Tentative Tract No. 61553

PROJECT LOCATION/ADDRESS: 22255 Mulholland Dr. Woodland Hills, CA 91364

COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA: Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills

COUNCIL DISTRICT: CD 3

WOODLAND HILLS HOMEOWNER ORGANIZATION
P.O. BOX 6368

RESPONSE TO:

EIR Case No. ENV-225-2301-EIR

Project Name: Vesting Tentative Tract No, 61533

Location: 22255 Mulholland Drive, Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Council District: 3

Due Date April 20, 2007

Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization's response.

The referred project is not acceptable because it requires exceptions to the Mulholland Scenic Parkways Specific Plan that are not acceptable as single family residences under RD 6 designation.

There are a number of mitigation measures that are not acceptable to protect the trees: From the summary it calls for Mitigation Measures: B-2, 15 gallon trees for Black walnuts is not acceptable; B-5, allowing foundations into drip line is not acceptable; B-7, any construction within the drip line of any Oak Tree is not acceptable; B-14, The City, especially the Mulholland DRB should be the one to pick the qualified arborist not the developer.

D-1 not only allows parking within drip lines but driving onto any part of the protected drip line.

D-3 is unenforceable and totally inadequate and cannot be considered a mitigation measure.

D-4 is unenforceable and totally inadequate and as such is not a viable mitigation measure.

Jurisdictional Resources: This is a known blue line stream that it appears on the maps. To ignore this, removes the need to limit grading and transformation of this area. Since there are willows there, one cannot say that it is not a water course since they would not have survived without a constant water source,

Conformance with Local Policies and Ordinances: This merely gives lip service since there has been no attempt that is significant to preserve the trees. The proposed development was put on paper to satisfy the developer and not to make this a well-designed project to protect the biological species that live there.

The bond is inadequate because the developer will be allowed to destroy and only pay a small amount to do what pleases him. It is a greatly inadequate EIR that does not conform to Land-form grading and does not fit the land but, rather, is fitting the land to what he wants.

Merely giving a pamphlet to homeowners does not protect the trees. There would have to be CC&R's that make the Association Liable for any abuse of the trees with substantial cash penalties and replacement and maintenance cost.

The very thought of encroachment into the drip line is not acceptable because it will be abused and no enforcement penalties can replace trees thus damaged.

Once again, no building must be allowed within the drip line as the developer will abuse it and the trees cannot be replaced with like size.

The qualified arborist must be one chosen by the Mulholland DRB.

Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.

This project is not consistent with the Mulholland Specific Plan. This project cannot be mitigated with the proposed mitigation measures B-1 through B-18 due to fact that they are subjective without any enforcement ability by the overseeing agencies and many of them invite destruction of trees and land that keeps this rural in nature by introducing numerous retaining walls that scar the land and the view.

Hillside Grading Ordinance

The amount of grading is unnecessary if the project was designed to fit the terrain. Instead it is predicated on retaining walls which are not what the grading ordinance is about.

Habitat Conservation Plan.

This is contrary to the discussion one, nesting birds, rodents and reptile on the subject site. There have to be substantial mitigation to protect the nesting of birds, rodents and reptiles on this site as well as provide corridors for roaming species that use the surrounding hillsides.

NOISE

G-9 Why is Shatto Place mentioned? We know of no Shatto Place in Woodland Hills. Therefore, we question the truthfulness of this EIR since it appears to be boilerplate language used in many EIR's and not specific to this proposed development.

Page V.A-6 This would result in significant loss of top soil due to the excessive excavation and re-compaction on various areas of development,

Page V.A-9 and V.A-15 This will alter the drainage pattern due to the blue line stream so impacts will occur.

They have not shown a calculation of the runoff from all the new impermeable surface they would be creating. It will be sizeable which will add to the problems of the L.A. River at peak storm runoffs during heavy periods of rain. They have not shown any retention basin to lessen the flow at such peak times.

V.A-16 To only divert 50% to recycling is not acceptable in new development. They must start with at least 75%.

V.D-13 This clearly states that there is a water source. It is presumptive that it supports nothing since they seemingly have done their own extrapolation without benefit of time spend observing the area and what really takes place on this land.

Table V.D-1 This states it is a probability of occurrence. There is no timed observation to show any honest, earnest effort to quantify the existence or number of each species. Some seem to have been left out that are know to inhabit this and other areas of Woodland Hills.

Page V.D-30 This section ignores the fact that Black Walnuts grow primarily where there is a fracture in the bedding plane. So it brings into question the validity of the Soils report.

Page V.D-35 D-2 Since there are no dates when construction would or could begin this becomes unenforceable and does not mitigate the interruption.

Page V.D-35 D-4 The phrase, “if feasible” totally negates the intent of this section. It would not be enforced and no penalties are even suggested.

Page V.D-39 The first bullet point is allowing driving through or parking by vehicles in the drip line. Not acceptable.

The 3rd bullet point allows excavation inside the drip lines. Not acceptable.

The 5th bullet point allows excavation inside drip lines with over excavation. Not acceptable.

ALTERNATIVES:

Alternative 2: This one is not acceptable due to violations of the Mulholland Specific Plan, over excavation, excessive retaining walls and the lack of proper authentic biological studies in the EIR, lack of 3rd party review of soils, geology, and hydrology studies. It does not differ enough from the proposed project to make it anymore viable since it has the same unacceptable grading, placement of roads and over-height houses, it cannot be mitigated to reduce it to “no significant impact in the Mulholland Corridor”.

Alternate 1 is fine but it leaves it wide open to future projects that would need better planning to reduce impacts to the Mulholland Corridor.

Alternate 3 is fine; however it doesn't say how it would be purchased.

COMMENTS

Given the past history of this developer's changing plans, not adhering to plans, not doing what was promised with biology and other flora and fauna requirements, it is doubtful that what is presented in this EIR will ever happen as written, (as poorly as it is), since, in past EIR's presented by this developer, projects ended up entirely different than when they went before the City Hearings. The public deserves better than what the history of this developer has delivered. We ask that this EIR not be validated, but sent back for rework so the public will be protected, and we urge that no exceptions to the Mulholland Specific Plan be allowed.

Submitted by:

James M. Spero, Board Member

Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization
4705 Almidor Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
818-591-9409