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

LEAD CITY AGENCY	COUNCIL	DISTRICT	DATE
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES	CD-3		August 10, 2005
PROJECT TITLE/NO. Vesting Tentative Tract Map. 61553		CASE NO.	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	DOES have	ve significant changes fro	m previous actions.
	DOES NO	T have significant chang	es from previous actions.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 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 approximately143,761 square feet of open space.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: 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.

PROJECT LOCATION: 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.

PLANNING DISTRICT Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-	US: PRELIMINARY PROPOSED ADOPTED	
EXISTING ZONING R1-1	MAX. DENSITY ZONING	DOES CONFORM TO PLAN
PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE	MAX DENSITY PLAN	DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN
(Q)RD-6	Low Density Residential (4-9 du/acre	
SURROUNDING LAND USES	PROJECT DENSITY 6 <i>du/acre</i>	□ NO DISTRICT PLAN

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:

- 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).
- 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 that 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.

X Aesthetics	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Public Services
Agricultural Resources	□ Hydrology/Water Quality	□ Recreation
🖾 Air Quality	☑ Land Use/Planning	□ Transportation/Traffic
Biological Resources	Mineral Resources	□ Utilities/Service Systems
Cultural Resources	🖾 Noise	Mandatory Findings of Significance
Geology/Soils	Population/Housing	

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

PROPONENT NAME	PHONE NUMBER
DS Ventures	(323) 658-1511
PROPONENTS ADDRESSES	
8383 Wilshire Blvd. #1000	
Beverly Hills, CA 90211	
AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST	DATE SUBMITTED
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning	
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)

	Å		1		
		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impost
I.	AESTHETICS Would the project	Significant impact	filcor por ateu	Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	\boxtimes			
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?	\boxtimes			
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	\boxtimes			
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	\boxtimes			
П.	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. 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?				
b.	Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				\boxtimes
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?				\square
III.	AIR QUALITY. 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?			\boxtimes	
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	\square			

- 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)?
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. 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 ?
- 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 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?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	\square			
ir				
	\boxtimes			
r				\boxtimes
3	\boxtimes			
у	\boxtimes			
				\square
ıl				
s,				\square
,	\boxtimes			
	_	_	_	
				\boxtimes
				\boxtimes

			Potentially Significant Unless		
		Potentially Significant Impact	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?				
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\square	
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\boxtimes	
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.				
ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?			\boxtimes	
iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes	
iv.	Landslides?				\boxtimes
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes	
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?			\square	
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?			\boxtimes	
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?				
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	1			\square
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and	\square			

		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?				
с.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	\boxtimes			
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?				
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?				
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?				\boxtimes
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes
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?			\square	
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal result in:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			\boxtimes	
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)?				
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?				\boxtimes
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				\boxtimes

		Potentially Significant Unless			
		Potentially Significant Impact	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?			\square	
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes
h.	Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
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?			\boxtimes	
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			\boxtimes	
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a.	Physically divide an established community?				\bowtie
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?				
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				\boxtimes
X.	MINERAL RESOURCES. 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?				\boxtimes
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?				
XI.	NOISE. 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	\boxtimes			

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	s 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?	\boxtimes			
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	\boxtimes			
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?				
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?				\boxtimes
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. 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)?			\boxtimes	
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
c.	Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES. 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?			\boxtimes	
b.	Police protection?			\boxtimes	
c.	Schools?			\boxtimes	
d.	Parks?			\boxtimes	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e.	Other public facilities?				
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?			\boxtimes	
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?				
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)?				
b.	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes
d.	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			\boxtimes	
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
XVI.	UTILITIES. Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing			\square	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	5 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?			\boxtimes	
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			\boxtimes	
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\boxtimes
XVI	I. 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