ROBERT JANOVICI
CHIEF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

ASSOCIATE ZONING ADMINISTRATORS
GARY BOOHER
R. NICOLAS BROWN
ANIK CHARRON
EMILY J. GABEL-LUDDY
DANIEL GREEN
LOURDES GREEN
DAVID KABASHIMA
ALBERT LANDINI
JON PERICA

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

JAMES K. HAHN
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
CON HOWE
DIRECTOR

FRANKLIN P. EBERHARD
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF
ZONING ADMINISTRATION
200 N. SPRING STREET, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 978-1318
FAX: (213) 978-1334

January 5, 2005

California Whitebird, Inc. (A)(O)
444 S. Flower Street, Suite 1300
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Planning Associates (R)
4040 Vineland Avenue, Suite 108
Studio City, CA 91604-3350

CMB Engineering (E)
6345 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 140
Building 11
Encino, CA 91316

Department of Building and Safety

CASE NO. CPC 2004-4345-SPP-SPR
PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE & SITE PLAN FINDINGS
Site Address: 7000 - 8000 La Tuna Canyon Road
Related Cases: VTTM 61672
CPC 2004-4344-GPA-ZC
Sunland-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon & Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Planning Areas
Zone: A1-1, A1-K, and RE11-1
Council District: 2
CEQA Clearance: ENV 2002-2481-EIR
Neighborhood Council: Foothill Trails District Sunland-Tujunga
Plan Land Use: Minimum Residential, Very Low I & Very Low II Residential, and Open Space
District Map: 195B193, 195B197 & various
Legal Description: POR Lot 203 Western Empire Tract, POR Lots 2 & 7 FR SEC 24 & various.

Pursuant to Sections 11.5.7 C of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, I hereby APPROVE:

A Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance Review to allow the construction, use and maintenance of 175 single family dwellings located within the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan Area; and

Pursuant to Section 16.05.E of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, I hereby APPROVE:

Site Plan Review for the construction, use and maintenance of 175 single-family dwellings in connection with Vesting Tentative Tract 61672.

All on 887 acres, located within the A1-1, A1-K and RE11 Zones.

Upon the following terms and conditions:

ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS

1. The use and development of the subject property shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan shown on Vesting Tentative Tract No. 61672 attached to the file, subject to revisions approved by the Advisory Agency.

2. Any subsequent changes to the subject plans shall be submitted in writing, identified with graphics detailing the proposed changes, and approved by the Director of Planning prior to obtaining a building permit from Department of Building and Safety.

3. The applicant shall reproduce this Determination on the cover page of the submitted building plans for each single-family dwelling. The Department of City Planning will not sign off on plans lacking this document.

4. Prior to plan check approval by the Department of Building and Safety, the following shall be submitted to the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan project staff, Community Planning Bureau, for verification of compliance with these Conditions of Approval:

    a. Site and landscape plans. The Site plan will also include proposed equestrian trails adjacent to the street system throughout the Approved project.

    b. Building plans, including elevations.

    c. Chart or other illustrative technique showing conformance with approved Development Standards required by Condition No. 5 in this determination.

    d. Chart or other illustrative technique showing conformance with all requirements for Prominent Ridgeline Protection Areas.

    e. A set of final grading plans for placement in the file.

    f. A copy of proposed Homeowners Association(s) covenants, codes and restrictions for placement in the file.

COMPLIANCE CONDITIONS

5. The applicant shall prepare development standards for the single-family homes; and the landscaping and the streetscape for the project. The development standards shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning or Advisory Agency in consultation with the Council office. After approval, the development standards shall

be included in the "Notes" portion of the plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety for plan check.

6. Building Height of the Scenic Highway Corridors and View shed Protection. The height of all structures shall be as follows:

   a. The maximum height of all single-family dwellings and accessory structures that are visible from the right-of-way of La Tuna Canyon Road or Interstate 210 shall not exceed 30 feet.

   b. The highest elevation of graded pads on the project site shall be at least 30 vertical feet below any designated Prominent Ridgeline directly above the highest point of the graded pad.

   c. The maximum height of single-family dwellings and accessory structures located on custom hillside lots that are visible from the right-of-way of La Tuna Canyon Road or Interstate 210 shall be at 25 vertical feet below any designated Prominent Ridgeline on the project site.

   d. The proposed single-family dwellings shall conform to the development standards to be approved pursuant to Condition No. 5, above.

7. Oak/Sycamore Trees Removal and Replacement.

   a. The applicant is authorized to remove 260 coast live oak trees and shall implement the final tree mitigation planting program for the project based on the conceptual tree planting program summarized in Table IV.D-16 in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (ENV-2002-2481-EIR) and the Addendum to the Tree Inventory and Impact Analysis (dated June 23, 2004) included in Appendix E to the Final Environmental Impact Report, as modified to conform to the specifications for the Development Areas in Vesting Tentative Tract No. 61672.

   b. The final tree planting program shall be approved by an independent certified arborist and shall include species, sizes, quantities, planting locations and planting specifications, as well as criteria for success and guidelines for monitoring and tree assessments. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right-of-ways, perimeters of detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification slopes and private residential lots.

   c. The final tree planting program shall include (1) with respect to all replacement plantings, a minimum replacement ratio of 7.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 6.7:1 for impacted western sycamores, (2) with respect to 15-gallon and

larger replacement stock, a minimum replacement ratio of 4.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 4.1:1 for impacted western sycamores, and (3) a 10-percent planting overage to allow for potential losses of replacement trees.

8. Prohibited Plant Materials. Future landscaping for any lot within the project shall not include any of the prohibited plant materials

9. MITIGATION MEASURES: An applicant for a grading or building permit shall comply with the following Mitigation Measures:

[MITIGATION MEASURES FOR IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT WITHOUT MITIGATION, WHERE MITIGATION NONETHELESS PROVIDED TO FURTHER REDUCE IMPACTS]

A. Air Quality

1) For all homes in the Development Areas located within 300 feet from the edge of Interstate 210, the Project Developer shall provide an information and disclosure statement to each prospective buyer and include such statement as part of the final sales literature, which statement shall include the following:

   a. The fact that the propose home is located within 300 feet form the edge of Interstate 210.

   b. A statement that this subject has been addressed in the Final EIR for the project and that the Final EIR is on file with the City of Los Angeles, Department of City planning.

   c. A statement that additional information regarding the potential health effect from proximity to freeways and other high traffic areas may be obtained from the SCAQMD and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment at the California Environmental Protection Agency.

B. Hydrology

1) Drainage from the building sites shall be directed toward the street in non-erosive drainage devices.

2) Building pads shall have sufficient height above the curb to drain towards the street on a slope of two percent. Pad drainage may be conveyed to the street via side lot swales, as required.

3) Where the tributary is deemed sufficient by the City Engineer and approved by the decision-maker, paved drainage terraces shall be provided along terrace, at the top of cuts, and behind retaining structures.

4) Mulch shall be used to the extent feasible in all landscape areas.

5) Existing tree and shrubs shall be preserved and protect, to the extent feasible.

6) Efficient irrigation systems that minimize runoff and evaporation, and maximize water that would reach the plant roots, such as a drip line system, shall be installed.

7) A timed irrigation system shall be provided for water conservation.

8) Slopes shall be graded so that runoff of surface water is minimized.

9) Permanent drainage and debris control facilities shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. As proposed such facilities shall include:

10) Underground storm drains with capacity for a 50-year frequency storm.

11) Terrace drains provided in compliance with the requirements of the LAMC.

12) Energy dissipaters installed at any outlet structure where the velocity is considered erosive.

13) Roof runoff collected in a rain gutter and downspout system and directed to approved areas via non-erodible conductors.

14) Semi-permeable pavement shall be utilized for landscape areas.

15) The Project shall adhere to applicable provisions of the LAMC Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan (if applicable) and the recommendations of the City Engineer/Department of Building and Safety.

C. Water Quality (Construction-Related Impacts)

1) Newly-excavated sites tend to contribute significant amounts of sediments and toxic materials to the drainage systems. The following steps shall be taken to minimize this process:

2) Where feasible, phase construction to limit activity during the wettest months of the year (i.e., December, January and February).

3) Stabilize exposed surfaces immediately after construction is complete, and ensure that permanent stabilization is successful, through implementation of the following:

- Minimization of stripped areas;
- Use of straw bale filters and sand bagging;
- Temporary seeding and mulching of all stripped areas;
- Conservation cultivation practices on steep slopes;
- Traffic control on construction sites;
- Berms and crushed stone on construction roads;
- Reduction of effective slope length in critical areas with benches or terraces; and
- Slopes shall be planted with protective vegetation and a suitable watering system (in conformance with City requirements) installed as soon as practical after completion of grading.

4) Use of accepted materials storage procedures, spill prevention and other "housekeeping" practices to prevent runoff contamination by toxic chemicals such as paints, solvents, pesticides, metals from building materials, or fuels.

5) The Project Developer shall be responsible for obtaining the necessary NPDES Construction Permit for the Site from the Regional Water Resources Control Board, Wastewater Division. The Project Developer shall obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) for compliance with the State's NPDES General Construction Permit prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Construction Permit NOI shall include a SWPPP to address construction sediment and erosion control. The Project Developer would also be required to address long-term monitoring and the implementation of BMPs to the maximum extent

6) practicable. "Maximum extent practicable" means to the maximum extent possible, taking into account the latest available technology and economic feasibility.

7) Temporary erosion control measures, such as landscaping, berms, etc., shall be implemented following grading to minimize sedimentation impacts to onsite drainages. Available measures include introduction of rapid developing, soil-anchoring groundcover (of native plant species), and strategic placement of runoff-detaining structures. These runoff-detaining structures and all remaining construction sediment and debris shall be removed at the time of project completion.

D. Water Quality (Long-Term Operational Impacts)

1) The Project Developer and the Association(s) shall work with the City to make residents of the Project aware of used motor oil recycling facilities

and household hazardous waste drop-off centers in the area. Availability of centers can reduce the amount of toxic contaminants found in urban runoff.

2) Signage shall be installed on all project storm drain inlets to read: "NO DUMPING OF WASTE-DRAINS TO OCEAN," or other similar signage consistent with forthcoming City policies.

3) Reducing pesticide and fertilizer use at the source can remove these pollutants from urban runoff. The Project Developer and the Association(s) shall adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs for use on their own public grounds in addition to promoting their use to project residents.

4) "Pooper-scooper" regulations shall be included in CC&Rs recorded in connection with the Project to require proper disposal of animal waste and to prevent additional nutrient loading of storm drains.

5) The Association(s) on a quarterly basis (or more frequently if reasonably required) shall complete cleaning of wastes and debris from all debris retention and water detention basins for the Project. Special importance shall be given to the cleaning of debris retention and water detention basins prior to the first rainstorm of the year, in order to reduce "first flush" effects on the area watershed and to prevent unnecessary sediment and waste load transport.

E. Biological Resources (Flora/Fauna; Endangered, Candidate, Sensitive or Special-Status Species; Wildlife Movement/Migration; Indirect Impacts; Cumulative Impacts)

1) If construction occurs during the nesting season for migratory birds (March 15-August 15), then prior to construction activities, the Project Developer shall have a qualified biologist survey the Site for the presence of any occupied raptor nests. If such a nest is found, it shall be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code.

2) If grading or clearing of vegetation is scheduled to take place during the nesting season for migratory or resident birds (March 15-August 15), a qualified biologist will survey areas to be graded no more than three days prior to the start of work. If active nests of migratory or resident birds are located, measures to ensure protection of the nesting migratory or resident bird will be determined by the monitoring

biologist and will depend on factors such as the bird species and the construction schedule. These measures may include, but are not limited to:

3) If a non-raptorial avian nest is identified that has either eggs or nestlings, the shrub or tree containing the nest will be clearly marked with flagging tape or caution ribbon to identify the presence of an active nest. No mechanized work will be allowed within 25 feet of the nest until the fledglings have departed the nest or until the biologist has determined that the nesting attempt has failed and been abandoned by the adult birds.

4) If a raptor nest is identified that has either eggs or nestlings, the shrub or tree containing the nest will be clearly marked with flagging tape or caution ribbon to identify the presence of an active nest. No mechanized work will be allowed within 200 feet of the nest until the fledglings have departed the nest or until the biologist has determined that the nesting attempt has failed and been abandoned by the adult birds.

5) All prospective homebuyers will be clearly advised of the implications of living adjacent to natural open space areas. The educational materials will be written to foster an appreciation of native ecosystems, and will identify appropriate measures that homeowners should take to minimize conflicts between wildlife, domestic animals, and humans, including:

6) Responsibilities and benefits associated with living near a wildland area (e.g., residents will be required to avoid planting invasive plant species, and will receive benefits related to maintaining the natural beauty of nearby open space areas).

7) Warnings of dangers and nuisances posed by wildlife that may forage at the development edge (e.g., dangers that mountain lions pose to humans and potential loss of pets to naturally occurring predators).

8) In order to minimize the movement of displaced animals into residential areas during clearing and grubbing of areas to be graded, such clearing and grubbing activities will start at the existing urban edge and move toward open space.

F. Biological Resources (Wildlife Movement)

1) The Project Developer shall install lower intensity lighting for the bridges that cross La Tuna Canyon Wash and Drainage 4.

2) The Association(s) shall maintain openings in walls at key locations within the Development Areas to enhance local movement paths.

G. Public Services (Police Protection)

1) During construction activities, the Project Developer shall ensure that all onsite areas of active development, material and equipment storage, and vehicle staging, that are adjacent to existing public roadways, be secured to prevent trespass.

2) The Project Developer shall submit a plot plan for the Project to the LAPD's Crime Prevention Section for review and comment. Security features subsequently recommended by the LAPD shall be implemented, to the extent feasible.

3) Upon completion of the Project, the Project Developer shall provide the Foothill Area Commanding Officer with a diagram of the Project. The diagram shall include access routes, addresses, and any other information that might facilitate prompt and efficient police response.

4) The Project Developer shall give the Foothill Area Commanding Officer access codes and/or keys to lock boxes to gated portions of the Site.

5) The Association(s) shall retain a single alarm and security patrol company to patrol the Development Areas and correct false alarms expeditiously.

6) The Association(s) shall ensure that clearly identifiable address indicators are provided for all homes and other buildings.

H. Energy Conservation (Electricity)

1) In the event of full or partial road closures, the Project Developer shall employ flagmen during the construction of the electrical distribution system to facilitate the flow of traffic.

2) During the design process, the Project Developer shall consult with the DWP's Efficiency Solutions Business Group regarding possible energy efficiency measures.

I. Energy Conservation (Natural Gas)

1) Prior to the start of construction, the Project's energy engineer shall consult with SCG for an energy analysis regarding efficiency and conservation measures.

2) The Project Developer shall hire flagmen to facilitate traffic flow during installation of the natural gas main extensions.

J. Utility Services (Water)

1) The Project Developer shall ensure that the landscape irrigation system be designed, installed and tested to provide uniform irrigation coverage. Sprinkler head patterns shall be adjusted to minimize over spray onto walkways and streets.

2) The Project Developer shall install either a "smart sprinkler" system to provide irrigation for the landscaped areas or, at a minimum, set automatic irrigation timers to water landscaping during early morning or late evening hours to reduce water losses from evaporation. Irrigation run times for all zones shall be adjusted seasonally, reducing water times and frequency in the cooler months (fall, winter, spring). Sprinkler timer run times shall be adjusted to avoid water runoff, especially when irrigating sloped property.

3) The Project Developer shall select and use drought-tolerant, low-water consuming plant varieties to reduce irrigation water consumption.

4) The Project Developer shall install ultra-low flush water toilets and water-saving showerheads in new construction. Low-flow faucet aerators should be installed on all sink faucets.

K. Utility/Services (Solid Waste)

1) Construction Mitigation:
   - The construction contractor shall only contract for waste disposal services with a company that recycles construction-related wastes.
   - To facilitate the onsite separation and recycling of construction-related wastes, the construction contractor should provide temporary waste separation bins in front of each home during construction.

2) Operational Mitigation:
   - The Project Developer shall make information published by the City regarding the curbside recycling program, as well as onsite composting methods for yard waste, available to purchasers of dwelling units at the time of sale.

- The Project Developer shall provide composting bins to purchasers of each new dwelling unit.

- The Project Developer shall provide trash compactors in each new residence to allow more effective and sanitary method of trash disposal.

L. EMF Exposure

1. For all residential lots in Development Area A located within 150 feet of the edge of the Transmission Line ROW, the Project Developer shall provide an EMF information and disclosure statement to each prospective buyer and include such a statement as part of the final sales literature, which statement shall include the following:

2. The location of SCE transmission lines in the vicinity of Development Area A.

3. A statement that this subject has been addressed in the Final EIR and that the Final EIR is on file with the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning.

4. A statement that additional information regarding the potential health effects from EMF exposure may be obtained from the California State Department of Health or by contacting the California EMF Project located at 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1700, Oakland, California 94612, or by viewing available information posted on the California EMF Project's official internet site at http:// www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/ehib/emf/general.html.

M. Archaeological Resources

In the event that unknown unique archaeological resources are disturbed during the course of development of the Project, the following mitigation measures shall be observed:

1. If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess their significance.

2. If the finds are termed significant (i.e., a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist and a Native American Observer shall be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation.

3. If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be those

of a Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento shall be contacted before the remains are removed in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code.

N. Cultural Resources

1) In the event fossil remains are encountered during grading activities, no further disturbance of the fossil remains shall occur until a vertebrate paleontologist approved by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Department has been retained by the Project Developer to evaluate be preserved as open space. There are also alluvium rock units located at the site of the proposed equestrian park and in portions of La Tuna Canyon Wash. However, the development of the Project would have no impact on those paleontological resources because no earth-moving activity would occur in those areas in connection with the development of the Project.

[MITIGATION MEASURES FOR POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED

O. Geology and Soils

1) The Project Developer shall incorporate setback zones from potential rock fall areas (as shown on Figure IV.A-1 in the Draft EIR). In areas where proposed structures may encroach within the setback area, rock fall containment devices shall be incorporated into the design. Examples of such devices include debris fences or walls, rock bolting and netting, or rock fall containment basins.

The Project Developer shall grade buttresses of existing landslides and install subdrainage systems to reduce the build-up of subsurface water, thereby increasing the stability of the slopes. At a minimum, slopes prone to landsliding shall be provided with a minimum keyway width of one-half of the slope height (with a minimum width of 12 feet), and a buttress fill to provide a final slope gradient of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) in accordance with the LABC.

a. The following mitigation shall be completed during grading using standard grading techniques in accordance with the LABC, which would reduce risks from landslides to an acceptable level. The Project Developer shall:

- Stabilize or remove Landslide 1 during grading.
- A cut slope proposed into Landslide 2 will require stabilization of the slope and a partial removal of the landslide mass.
- Landslide 3 shall include a shear key for the outside edge of the roadway above.
- Landslides 5 and 6 shall be removed during grading.

- The outside edge of the lot above Landslide 10 will require a shear key to proposed building pads above.
- Landslide 11 will require a partial excavation of the landslide mass to provide support for the adjacent fill slope.

b) The Project Developer shall replace most cut slopes, as required, with a stabilization fill slope or buttress fill slope with a maximum slope gradient of 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). Any slope that cannot be rebuilt as a 2:1 or flatter shall be rebuilt as a reinforced slope or lessened to a 2:1 gradient with retaining walls.

c) The Project Developer shall ensure that temporary back cut slopes associated with remedial grading of stabilization fills and buttress slopes shall not exceed a slope gradient of 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical), and shall more typically maintain a slope gradient of 2:1. Fill widths at the top of the proposed slopes shall maintain a minimum width of 15 feet. Buttress and stabilization fills shall be built with keyways with a minimum width of one-half the slope height (with a minimum width of 12 feet) and supplied with subdrainage to preclude buildup of water. Design, grading and construction of the proposed cut slopes shall conform with the LABC.

d) Geology and Soils (volunteered, not required mitigation measures)
Although additional mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the following additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the Project's construction-related impacts on geology and soils:

e) Excavation and grading activities shall be scheduled during dry weather periods. If grading occurs during the rainy season (October 15 through April 1), diversion dikes to channel runoff around the site shall be constructed. Channels shall be lined with grass or pavement shall be roughened to reduce runoff velocity.

f) Appropriate erosion control and drainage devices to the satisfaction of the Building and Safety Department, Grading Division, shall be incorporated, such as interceptor terraces, berms, vee-channels, and inlet and outlet structures, as specified by Section 91.7013 of the LABC, including planting fast-growing annual and perennial grasses in areas where construction is not immediately planned to shield and bind the soil.

g) All construction waste shall be disposed of properly. Appropriately labeled recycling bins shall be provided to recycle construction materials, including solvents, water-based paints, vehicle fluids, broken asphalt and concrete,

wood and vegetation. Non-recyclable materials/wastes shall be taken to an appropriate landfill. Toxic wastes shall be discarded at a licensed regulated disposal site.

h) During construction, leaks, drips and spills shall be immediately cleaned up to prevent contaminated soil on paved surfaces that can be washed away into the storm drains.

i) During construction, pavement shall not be hosed down at material spills and dry cleanup methods shall be used whenever possible.

j) During construction, dumpsters shall be covered and maintained. Uncovered dumpsters shall be placed under a roof or cover with tarps or plastic sheeting.

k) During construction, gravel approaches shall be used where truck traffic is frequent to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment into streets.

l) During construction, all vehicle/equipment maintenance, repair and washing shall be conducted away from storm drains. All major repairs shall be conducted offsite. Drip pans or drop clothes shall be used to catch drips and spills.

Q. Biological (Flora/Fauna; Vegetation Associations; Jurisdictional and non-Jurisdictional Waters and Habitat)

a. The Project Developer shall create a water quality basin in the lower reach of Drainage 4 that covers approximately 2.5 acres. The basin shall be planted with a mosaic of wetland/riparian habitats that will provide both biogeochemical (water quality) and habitat functions. The proposed habitats shall include southern coast live oak riparian forest at the upper elevations, southern mixed riparian in the middle elevations and wet meadow or emergent marsh in the wettest (lowest) areas.

b. The Project Developer shall preserve and enhance approximately 2.5 acres within La Tuna Canyon Wash that exhibit moderate to high levels of infestation by sticky eupatory (*Ageratina adenophora*) and African umbrella sedge (both are recognized as invasive exotic species). The enhancement program shall include eradication of sticky eupatory and African umbrella sedge from the onsite reach through a

five-year program. The five-year program shall also include replanting with native understory species in areas where the dense understory formed by sticky eupatory has been removed.

c. The mitigation and monitoring plan with respect to Mitigation Measures (a) and (b), above shall be subject to the approval of the Army Corps, CDFG and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

d. The Project Developer shall provide 1.89 acres of native riparian plantings within the proposed onsite detention basins and water quality basins and other appropriate areas.

e. The Project Developer shall revegetate 2.12 acres of southern mixed riparian forest and 0.51 acre of southern coast live oak riparian forest.

f. The Association(s) shall monitor the landscaped areas over a five-year period following the completion of landscaping in a Development Area and remove, as necessary, unwanted non-native invasive species that become established, ensuring that, over time, native habitats are established.

R. Noise (Impacts on Proposed Homes)

1. In order to meet the Caltrans standard regarding freeway noise, one of the following two options shall be implemented:

   Sound walls shall be constructed at the locations and heights shown in Figure IV.E-2 in the Draft EIR, as revised in Figure 3-S in Appendix F to the Final EIR.

   The elevations or locations of the homes shall be altered and/or intervening berms or landform features shall be integrated into the project design.

2) The project design and construction will incorporate all applicable building codes that relate to building sound insulation, including appropriate use of double-glazed windows, etc.

S. Transportation and Traffic

1) The following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce the impact at the intersection of Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road to a less-than-significant level:

Fund the design and installation of a traffic signal compatible with Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control/Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATSAC/ATCS) for the

intersection of Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road. The above transportation improvement, including all necessary dedications, widening and signal installation, shall be guaranteed before the issuance of any building permit through the B-Permit process of the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (BOE) and encroachment permit of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Prior to setting the bond amount of the B-Permit, the BOE shall require that the Project Developer's engineer or contractor to contact City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) B-Permit Coordinator at (213) 580-5322 to arrange a pre-design meeting to finalize the design for the required transportation improvements. The traffic signal shall be constructed and completed, before the issuance of any certificate of occupancy, to the satisfaction of LADOT, the BOE and Caltrans.

The implementation of this mitigation measure would fully mitigate the significant traffic impact at this intersection.

2) Although additional mitigation measures are not required under CEQA, the following additional mitigation measures are proposed to reduce further the Project's less-than-significant traffic impacts:

- With respect to the section of La Tuna Canyon Road adjacent to the Site, (1) the Project Developer shall dedicate along the entire Project frontage on La Tuna Canyon Road to bring the right-of-way up to the standard required by the General Plan, (2) the Project Developer shall construct improvements on La Tuna Canyon Road so as to provide two lanes in each direction with left-turn channelization at the access points for Development Area A and Development Area B and (3) except as required to provide left-turn channelization as described above, no additional roadway widening along the Project's La Tuna Canyon Road frontage shall be required.

- The Project Developer shall contact the Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works to ensure compliance with the requirements of the City Engineer for equestrian trails adjacent to roadways in the Approved project.

- The driveway to Development Area A on La Tuna Canyon Road shall be aligned as the north leg of the signalized intersection at Development Area A access/Interstate 210 westbound ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road.

- To avoid the encroachment of vehicles onto the public right-of-way, a minimum of 40 feet of reservoir space shall be provided at each driveway. This distance shall be measured from the property line to the first parking stall and/or gate.

- The driveways for Development Area B shall be located away from any blind curve along La Tuna Canyon Road. Queuing and merging areas shall be provided for ingress and egress vehicles, respectively. The driveways serving Development Area B shall be consistent with the requirement(s) of LADOT and other City departments.

- As backing into or out of arterial highways or collector streets is not permitted, the path and location of all trucks and vehicles with horse trailers shall be indicated on the parking area and driveway plan submitted by the Project Developer to LADOT prior to the issuance of building permits.

- Final LADOT approval shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any building permits. This shall be accomplished by submitting a detailed site/driveway plan, at a scale of at least 1 inch = 40 feet, to LADOT's Valley Development Review Section at 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite 320, Van Nuys. This site/driveway plan shall be submitted as soon as possible, prior to the submittal of building plans to the Department of Building and Safety.

T. Fire Protection

1) An automatic fire sprinkler system shall be provided in each structure in accordance with Section 57.09.07 of the LAMC.

2) With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the Project would not have a significant impact on fire protection services. However, the following additional mitigation measures are recommended to reduce further the Project's potential fire protection impacts:

3) At least two different ingress/egress roads shall be provided for each Development Area that will accommodate major fire apparatus and provide for major evacuation during emergency situations.

4) Private streets and entry gates shall be built to City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the LAFD.

5) Construction of public or private roadways in the development shall not exceed 15 percent in grade.

6) Private development shall conform to the standard street dimensions shown on City Department of Public Works Standard Plan D-22549 regarding travel-way width (i.e., curb-to-curb).

7) Standard cut-corners shall be used on all turns.

8) The width of private roadways for general access use and fire lanes shall not be less than 20 feet clear to the sky.

9) Fire lanes, where provided, and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be provided.

10) All access roads, including fire lanes, shall be maintained in an unobstructed manner, removal of obstructions shall be at the owner's expense. The entrance to all fire lanes or private driveways shall be posted with a sign no less than three square feet in area in accordance with Section 57.09.05 of the LAMC.

11) Fire lane width shall not be less than 20 feet. When a fire lane must accommodate the operation of LAFD aerial ladder apparatus or where fire hydrants are installed, those portions shall not be less than 28 feet in width.

12) Private roadways for general access use shall have a minimum width of 20 feet.

13) Where access for a given development requires accommodation of LAFD apparatus, minimum outside radius of the paved surface shall be 35 feet. An additional six feet of clear space must be maintained beyond the outside radius to a vertical point 13 feet six inches above the paved surface of the roadway.

14) No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road or designated fire lane.

15) To reduce the potential for confusion, slow response, and other attendant difficulties that may arise during an emergency evacuation situation, which could hamper evacuation activities on La Tuna Canyon Road, the project developer shall prepare and distribute to each homeowner a copy of an evacuation plan prepared specifically for the Project. The plan shall be submitted to the LAPD and LAFD for review prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy. Upon establishment, it shall become the responsibility of the homeowners' association(s) to distribute the evacuation plan to new homeowners. The major features of the plan shall address the following issues:

16) A program of clear and explicit procedures, responsibilities and courses of action to be followed in the event of an emergency.

17) A program for the coordination of evacuation efforts with the Los Angeles Police and Fire Departments.

18) A map showing alternative evacuation routes.

19) The number and location of adequate offsite public and onsite private fire hydrants shall be provided as determined by the LAFD's review of the vesting tentative tract map.

20) All landscaping shall use indigenous fire-resistant plants and materials, based on the LAFD's list of such plants.

21) All homes shall have noncombustible roofs (non-wood).

22) The brush in the area adjacent to the Development Areas shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the Association(s) under supervision of the LAFD in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.

23) The vesting tentative tract map, indicating access roads and turning areas, shall be submitted for LAFD approval.

24) Adequate fire hydrants shall be provided.

25) Definitive plans and specifications shall be submitted to the LAFD and requirements for necessary permits satisfied prior to commencement of construction.

[SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION MEASURES]

U. Air Quality (NOx and PM 10 Emissions During Construction)

1) Moisten soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving soil and three times a day, or four times a day under windy conditions, in order to maintain soil moisture of 12 percent.

2) On the last day of active operations prior to a weekend or holiday or before beginning grading on another portion of the Site, apply water or a chemical stabilizer to maintain a stabilized surface. Maintain this surface crust as long as the disturbed soil remains uncovered.

3) Water excavated soil piles hourly or cover piles with temporary coverings.

4) Cease grading during periods when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

5) Operate vehicles on unpaved roads at 15 mph or less.

6) Apply appropriate NO_x control technologies, such as use of lean-NO_x catalyst or diesel oxidation catalyst, to the extent feasible.

7) Blasting and crushing equipment shall be equipped with water spray devices in order to maintain soil moisture and prevent fugitive dust emissions.

8) Cease grading during periods when the SCAQMD calls a Stage 1 episode in SRA 8.

V. Biological Resources (Native Trees)

1) The following mitigation measures are intended to minimize impacts to coast live oak trees and western sycamore trees.

2) However, the ultimate decision to implement any or all mitigation measures described below will be made by the project arborist in consultation with the project engineer.

3) The project arborist shall identify the tree's Optimal Protection Zone (OPZ) in the field and staking of this zone in a half-circle adjacent to the development edge (Appendix D to the Tree Inventory and Impact Analysis (which is attached as Appendix G to the Draft EIR) provides the formulas necessary to calculate the OPZ of a coast live oak or western sycamore).

4) The project arborist shall ensure that protective fencing is installed around the perimeter of the tree's OPZ or at the edge of the limit of the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area (as defined in Section VI.D.2 (Native Trees) of the Draft EIR), whichever is closer to the trunk (see the illustration in Figure IV.D-19 in the Draft EIR). The protective fencing shall be temporary and shall be removed upon the completion of ground-disturbing activities. The fence shall be a chain link fence with posts placed no greater than 10 feet on center. The project arborist shall identify all trees requiring temporary fencing and shall verify that the fences are in place prior to

commencement of grading operations within 50 feet of the OPZ of any tree not scheduled for removal or not identified as "impacted" in the permit issued by the City. Exceptions to the fencing requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.

5) The project arborist shall ensure the placement of four inches of wood-chip mulch over the ground surface within the OPZ where that zone extends beyond the protective fencing and into the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area. This measure may be necessary to limit the compacting effect of heavy equipment on topsoil within the root zone of protected trees. Where appropriate, the four-inch mulch layer shall be placed under the supervision of the project arborist and shall be placed upon first encroachment of grading equipment into the OPZ. Exceptions to the mulching requirement may be made where preserved tree locations make unintended impacts sufficiently unlikely due to the presence of steep terrain or other physical barrier.

6) Should any protected tree's branches overlap the outer edge of the 20-Foot Wide Disturbance Area and require pruning in order to allow grading to proceed, the pruning shall be performed or supervised by the project arborist or another certified arborist.

7) The project arborist shall follow or accompany the survey crews prior to the commencement of grading in order to confirm impacts to trees scheduled to be impacted and to confirm avoidance of trees scheduled for preservation. Should any adjustments to the total impact figures be necessary, the project arborist shall notify the project proponent and the Project Developer, which shall notify the City of the revision.

8) The conceptual tree planting program specified in the Draft EIR provides for planting of 1,806 coast live oak trees, 181 western sycamores, and thousands of other container stock associated with oak woodlands, chaparral, coastal sage scrub and riparian forests.

9) The Project Developer shall implement the final tree planting program for the Project, which shall be based on the conceptual tree planting program summarized in Table IV.D-16 in the Draft EIR and the Addendum to the Tree Inventory and Impact Analysis in Appendix E to the Final EIR, as modified to conform to the specifications for the Development Areas in the approved vesting

tentative tract map. The final tree planting program shall be approved by an independent certified arborist and shall include species, sizes, quantities, planting locations and planting specifications, as well as criteria for success and guidelines for monitoring and tree assessments. The plantings would occur within entry points, common areas, road right-of-ways, perimeters of detention basins, common slopes, flood control facilities, fuel modification slopes and private residential lots. Consistent with the conceptual tree planning program, the final tree planning program shall include (1) with respect to all replacement plantings, a minimum replacement ratio of 7.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 6.7:1 for impacted western sycamores, (2) with respect to 15-gallon and larger replacement stock, a minimum replacement ratio of 4.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks and 4.1:1 for impacted western sycamores, and (3) a 10-percent planting overage to allow for potential losses of replacement trees.

11. It is estimated that the proposed conceptual tree planting program would provide approximately $197,900 of tree stock, ranging from acorns to 60-inch boxes. This figure includes $190,410 in tree stock of 15-gallon or greater in size and approximates the value of the trees to be replaced. In contrast, the discussion below describes the value of the trees to be replaced as $190,224 under the "Fair Market Value" method. This tree planting would be only a part of the overall landscape palette, which would also include native plantings and climate-adapted plantings.

12. All tree plantings shall be subject to a five-year monitoring effort by an independent certified arborist. This monitoring effort shall consider growth, health, and condition of subject trees in order to evaluate the project's success. This monitoring effort might result in recommendation of remedial actions should any of the tree plantings exhibit poor or declining health. These actions may include more frequent monitoring, installation of protective devices, pruning for larger specimens, integrated pest management (IPM) for pest or disease infestation and other professionally accepted methods to improve the health and vigor of a tree. Fencing and other protective measures could be required for trees less than four (4) feet tall (including acorn plantings) planted in areas where soil compaction, foot traffic, and equine or other recreational uses may occur. These measures shall remain in place until the trees are large enough to be self-protecting. Any coast live oak that fails during the monitoring period shall be replaced with a tree of the same species and equivalent trunk diameter.

W. Noise (Construction)

1) Construction activities, including job-site deliveries, shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., provided that such construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. to the extent such construction activities are conducted within 500 feet of any existing residential buildings.

2) In accordance with Section 41.40(c) of the LAMC, construction activities, including job-site deliveries, shall not be conducted within 500 feet of any existing residential buildings before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday or any national holiday or at any time on Sunday.

3) Prohibit use of adjoining residential streets by construction personnel and construction-related vehicles for parking.

4) An area should be designated as far from residential areas as feasible for the delivery of materials and equipment to the Site.

5) Stage deliveries to occur from mid-morning to mid-afternoon, where feasible, to take advantage of times when residential zones are less susceptible to annoyance from outside noise.

6) Coordinate deliveries to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload for protracted periods of time.

7) All construction equipment shall be equipped with the manufacturers' recommended noise muffling devices, such as mufflers and engine covers. These devices should be kept in good working condition throughout the construction process.

8) To the extent feasible, hydraulic equipment instead of pneumatic impact tools and electric powered equipment instead of diesel powered equipment shall be used for exterior construction work.

9) Maintaining equipment in an idling mode shall be minimized. All equipment not in use shall be turned off.

10) For smaller equipment (such as, air-compressors and small pumps), line-powered equipment shall be used to the extent feasible.

11) The Project Developer shall appoint a construction coordinator to interface with the general contractor and neighboring

communities. The construction coordinator shall be accessible to resolve problems related to the effects of project construction on the surrounding community, to the extent feasible. The construction coordinator shall also provide information to the surrounding community regarding scheduling of specific construction activities (e.g., grading and blasting) and construction phasing.

X. Artificial Light and Glare

1) The Project shall include CC&Rs that prohibit the use of all exterior uplighting fixtures for building facades and trees, establish design limits on the amount of landscape lighting per foot, permit only downlighting for all exterior-building mounted fixtures, and prohibit "glowing" fixtures that would be visible from existing communities or public roads.

2) The CC&Rs shall specify that night lighting on private property located on any lot located within 100 feet of Interstate 210 rights-of-way, as shown on the vesting tentative tract map, shall be permitted, provided it is low-height, low illumination safety lighting that is shielded and directed onto the property.

3) For internal street lighting, the minimum maintained average illuminance level shall be reduced from 0.4 footcandle (fc) to 0.2 fc by reducing the wattage of the street lighting fixtures while maintaining the IES recommended uniformity ratio of 6:1 minimum to average fc.

4) Roadway light fixtures shall be full cut-off, well-shielded fixtures that will allow no direct beam illumination into the night sky or into adjacent open space areas.

5) Exterior buildings finishes shall be non-reflective and use natural subdued tones.

6) All roofs visible from Interstate 210 and/or La Tuna Canyon Road shall be surfaced with non-reflective materials.

Y. Aesthetics

1) All structures on the Site shall comply with the applicable requirements in the Specific Plan.

2) All fences, gates and walls visible from Interstate 210 or La Tuna Canyon Road shall be constructed of one or more of the following

materials: rough-cut, unfinished wood; native-type stone; split-face concrete bloc; textured plaster surface walls; black or dark green chain link; wrought-iron in combination with small-gauge tubular steel posts (tubing posts not to exceed 1½" square in dimension).

3) The Project Developer shall prepare and implement a landscape plan that provides planting and maintenance guidance for common landscaped areas, slopes, and undeveloped building pads. A separate landscape plan may be prepared for each Development Area. The Project Developer shall be responsible for the plan's implementation until such time as an Association assumes responsibility for landscape maintenance. The landscape plan shall be subject to the review and approval by the Department of City Planning prior to issuance of any grading permit. To ensure its implementation, the landscape plan shall be incorporated into the project's CC&Rs. Major features of the landscape plan shall include:

A listing of plant species appropriate for use for both temporary slope stabilization purposes and long-term landscaping designs for common areas. The plan shall emphasize the use of drought-tolerant, fire retardant, native plant species. Only native or non-invasive, non-native plant species shall be included in the listing of acceptable planting materials. In addition, wherever practical, plants which are relatively pest resistant and which require a minimum of added nutrients shall be utilized in landscaping.

a. Retention of a landscape contractor thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the landscape plan, by the Association(s), for ongoing implementation of the landscape plan.

b. All utilities installed in connection with the development of the Development Areas shall be placed underground.

c. All roofs visible from Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road shall be surfaced with non-glare materials and no equipment shall be placed thereon. This provision shall not apply to solar energy devices and satellite dishes.

d. Where feasible, drainage devices (terrace drains, benches and intervening terraces) visible from surrounding areas shall be bermed and placed in swales.

e. Concrete drains and all other drainage devices shall be tinted with an appropriate earth tone to effectively conceal them from surrounding views.

OBSERVANCE OF CONDITIONS - TIME LIMIT - LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES - TIME EXTENSION

All terms and conditions of this Director of Planning Determination shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditioned upon the privileges being utilized within **two years** after the effective date of this determination. If such privileges are not utilized or substantial physical construction work has not begun within and carried on to completion, the authorization shall terminate and become void. The Director of Planning or his/her designee may extend the termination date for one additional period, not to exceed one year, if a written request on appropriate forms, accompanied by the applicable fee, is filed with a public office of the Department of City Planning setting forth the reasons for the request and if the Director of Planning or his/her designee concurs.

TRANSFERABILITY

This determination runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them regarding the conditions of this grant.

VIOLATIONS OF THE CONDITIONS, A MISDEMEANOR

Section 11.00 M of the Los Angeles Municipal Code states: "It shall be unlawful to violate any provision or fail to comply with any of the requirements of this Code. Any person violating any of the provisions or failing to comply with any of the mandatory requirements of this Code shall be guilty of a misdemeanor unless that violation or failure is declared in that section to be an infraction. An infraction shall be tried and be punishable as provided in Section 19.6 of the Penal Code and the provisions of this section. Any violation of this Code that is designated as a misdemeanor may be charged by the City Attorney as either a misdemeanor or an infraction."

Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor, either by fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both fine and imprisonment.

APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

This grant is not a permit or license. Any permit or license required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. Furthermore, if any condition of this grant is violated, the applicant or his/her successor in interest may be prosecuted according to Section 11.00 M of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

All appeals shall be filed pursuant to procedures established under Section 11.5.7 C 6 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Per Section 11.5.7 C 4 (c) of the Los

Angeles Municipal Code, the Determination in this matter will become effective January 20, 2005, unless an appeal is filed. It is strongly advised that appeals be filed early during the appeal period and in person so that imperfections/ incompleteness may be corrected before the appeal period expires. Any appeal must be filed on the prescribed forms, accompanied by the required fee, a copy of this Determination, and received and receipted at a public office of the Department of City Planning on or before 15 days from the date of this letter or the appeal will not be accepted. Forms are available on-line at http://cityplanning.lacity.org. Planning Department public offices are located at:

Figueroa Plaza Public Counter
201 North Figueroa Street, #400
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 482-7077

Marvin Braude San Fernando Valley
Constituent Service Center
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite 251
Van Nuys, CA 91401
(818) 374-5050

The applicant is further advised that all subsequent contact regarding this Determination must be with the decision-maker who acted on the case. This would include clarification, verification of conditions compliance and plan or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished by appointment only in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting.

FINDINGS

PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE FINDINGS (L.A.M.C. SECTION 11.5.7)

1. **The project substantially complies with the applicable standards, and provisions of the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Preservation Specific Plan**

   The San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 75,736, adopted 12/19/03; Eff. 2/8/04) establishes specific land use regulations for ridgeline and ridgeline area protection, building heights, Scenic Highway and Corridor protection, landform grading, oak tree preservation, specific plant materials prohibitions, minimum lot sizes, equine-keeping, other animal-keeping, official and unofficial trails, vista points and staging areas and slope density applications.

   The Specific Plan is intended to preserve, protect, and enhance the unique natural and cultural resources of the Plan area. The Specific Plan accomplishes these goals by establishing four general areas of regulation: (1) Prominent Ridgeline Protection measures to protect designated Prominent Ridgelines; (2) Biological Resource Protection measures to protect oak trees and unique native

plant communities; (3) Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection measures to establish standards to assure that the design of projects and related improvements within designated scenic highway corridors preserve, complement and/or enhance the views from these corridors; and (4) Equinekeeping District protection measures.

The proposed project (the "Project") falls under the definition of a "Project" pursuant to the Specific Plan. The proposed project includes the construction of 175 single-family homes within the Specific Plan area. Grading and building permits will be required for the construction of the proposed homes. Other permits will be required for the construction of street improvements, storm drains, utility extensions, and sewer construction.

Prominent Ridgeline/PR Protection Area (Section 6.A, 6.B. The Site contains or is adjacent to several designated Prominent Ridgelines, as shown Map No. 2 in the Specific Plan and on Figure IV.G-3 in the Draft EIR. None of the proposed 175 homes will be located in whole or in part in a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area. The applicant has submitted an exhibit showing the Prominent Ridgelines and Prominent Ridgeline Protection Areas in relation to the total Site and the limits of grading within the proposed Development Areas.

None of the project buildings or structures will be constructed so that the highest point of the roof, structure or parapet wall is less than 25 vertical feet from the designated Prominent Ridgeline directly above the highest point of the building or structure when located within a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area (Section 6.A.2).

The limits of grading established by the approved Vesting Tentative Tract Map, a related project (Related-VTTM), will not affect this Prominent Ridgeline or its related Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area. The proposed homes that are immediately south of this Prominent Ridgeline are all situated on pads graded to an elevation of 30 feet or more below the elevation of the Prominent Ridgeline.

The maximum height of these proposed homes is 30 feet. Therefore, the silhouette of these homes will not break the silhouette of this Prominent Ridgeline as viewed from the north side of the Prominent Ridgeline (Section 6.A.3).

The Related-VTTM is designed so that no grading or berming occurs that would alter the elevation of the crest of any designated Prominent Ridgeline (Section 6.A.4).

Landform Grading. Landform grading is a requirement of the Related-VTTM approval. Landform Grading Manual, a document adopted by the City Council in

June 1983, describes landform grading techniques -- including landform planting techniques where it is not safe to contour grade land -- and will be applied.

Landform cut and fill grading techniques are utilized where practical on the lots designated for single-family home. Grading will also be necessary for vehicular access, storm drainage facilities, utilities and landscaping. Grading operations will affect approximately 239 acres of the Site including remedial grading.

The Specific Plan's policy on Landform Grading is not mandatory, but instead is permissive and intended as a guideline consistent with City policy. Nonetheless, where it is practical and feasible, slopes will be graded in accordance with the Landform Grading Manual and otherwise comply with the guidelines in Section 6.A.5 of the Specific Plan. However, while the graded slopes would have a variety of slope ratios, the ratio of some graded slopes would exceed a ratio of 2:1 (Section 6.A.5).

The approved Related-VTTM is designed so that no native vegetation will be removed within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area (Section 6.A.6).

Prohibition on Certain Structures. No fire pits, picnic tables, or other similar structures associated with the proposed residential development will be located within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area (Section 6A.7).

Encroachment into PR Ridgeline Protection Area None of the proposed 175 homes will be located in whole or in part in a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area. No grading is proposed in whole or in part in a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area. Therefore, no encroachment is required into a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area (Section 6.A.8).

Equine-Keeping A small portion of the approved VTTM is designated A1-1-K. All A1 zoned property is permitted equine-keeping (Section 7.A and B).

Non-Public Equestrian trails None of the existing or proposed official or non-public equestrian trails shown on Map Nos. 3 and 4 in the Specific Plan are located within the Site. No volunteer easements are offered, nor none accepted, under this determination (Section 7.C).

As shown on Figure IV.G-5 in the Final EIR and Specific Plan Map No. 4, a segment of a non-public equestrian trail is located on the southern portion of the site to the west. The area where this non-public equestrian trail is located is currently designated Minimum Residential under the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan, and it will be unaffected by the tract approval as it will likely become a portion of a lot. The non-public equestrian trail may not be affected by the Project.

Equestrian Staging/Access to Trails. Under this determination, no provision is made for any three-acre Equestrian Park, inasmuch as the slope density application does not afford additional amenities within the constraints of the current plan and zone. However, the project is required to provide equestrian trails throughout adjacent to all streets (or separated where it is practical to do so) as an alternative (Section 7.C).

Equestrian Crossings The Specific Plan requires that the Director of Planning or Advisory Agency determine safe cross walks and signals, particularly for equestrians. None of the three intersections where crosswalks are required by the Specific Plan (i.e., Sunland Boulevard and Wornum Avenue, Mt. Gleason and Big Tujunga Canyon Road, and Wentworth Street and Wheatland Avenue) are located within the Site (Section 7.C).

The Director of Planning/Advisory Agency concludes it may be desirable to install a new signalized cross walk for equestrians, where appropriate, along La Tuna Canyon, but has not made this a condition of project permit approval (Section 7.C).

Vista Points Specific Plan Map No. 3 shows vista points and staging areas in the Specific Plan area. These vista points and staging areas are not located within the Site. While the applicant proposed the three-acre equestrian park located on the property that is adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road on the most southwesterly portion of the site, this has not been made a requirement in the approved Related-VTTM (Section 7.C).

Slope Density has been applied to the subject ownership and a Revised Map and Modification of conditions application is required thereby, prior to the recordation of the Related-VTTM final map (Section 8.A).

Oak Trees Of the estimated 1,247 coast live oak trees on the site, up to 260 will be removed in connection with the development of the Project. The additional oak tree removal will be necessary to permit reasonable development of the property including the installation of roadways and utilities. Loss of those coast live oak trees will have unavoidable and short-term impacts. However, the removal of the coast live oak trees will be unavoidable and short term.

A unique oak tree Replacement Program is incorporated into these conditions of approval because of the wildlands nature of the property. Replacement will occur through the establishment of varied sizes of replacement oaks, ranging from acorns to large boxed specimens, in association with the planting of other native plant species known to naturally coexist with coast live oaks on hillsides, in open space areas, and in fuel modification areas adjacent to natural open spaces.

The final tree planting program for coast live oaks will include, with respect to all replacement planting, a minimum replacement ratio of 7.6:1. With respect to 15-gallon size and larger replacement stock, the minimum replacement ratio for coast live oaks will be 4.6:1. In addition, a 10 percent planting overage will be required for the potential losses of coast live oaks and western sycamore replacement trees.

All tree planting will be subject to a five-year monitoring effort by an independent certified arborist. Any coast live oak that fails during the monitoring period shall be replaced with a tree of the same species and equivalent trunk diameter.

In conjunction with the Advisory Agency's approval of the VTTM, the Advisory Agency has also approved the removal of up to 260 oak trees in accordance with Section 8.B of the Specific Plan (Section 8.B).

Prohibited Plants Prohibition of certain plant materials is critical to long-term maintenance of the wildland character of the property. Therefore, plants prohibited by the Specific Plan will be required to be enumerated in the covenants, codes and restrictions of the Homeowners Association and have also been incorporated as a prohibition by Condition No. 8 of this action.

Acacia	*green wattle*
Ailanthus altissima	*tree of heaven*
Arundinaria pygmaea	
Arundo donax	*giant reed*
Atriplex semibaccata	*Australia saltbush*
Avena spp.	*wild oats*
Brassica spp. (non-native)	*mustard*
Bromus rubens	*red brome*
Centranthus ruber	*Jupiter's beard*
Cypressus sempervirens	*Italian cypress*
Cortaderia jubata	*pampas grass*
Cortaderia sellowiana	*pampas grass*
Cytisus canariensis	*Canary Island broom*
Cytisus scoparius	*Scotch broom*
Cytisus spachianus (Genista racemosa)	*broom*
Erodium botrys	*storksbill*
Erodium cicutarium	*storksbill*
Erodium cygnorum	*storksbill*
Erodium malacoides	*storksbill*
Erodium moschatum	*storksbill*
Eucalytpus globulus	*blue gum*

Lolium perenne	*perennial ryegrass*
Malva parvifolia	*cheeseweed*
Pennisetum setaceum	*fountain grass*
Ricinus communis	*castor bean*
Robinia pseudoacacia	*black locust*
Schinus molle	*California pepper*
Schinus terebinthefolius	*Brazilian pepper*
Spartium junceum	*Spanish broom*
Tamarix sp.	*salt cedar*
Vulpia megalura	*foxtail fescue palm*

(Section 8.C)

Animal-Keeping All lots within the Approved Project will be permitted the keeping of equines, goats or other domestic livestock, not for commercial purposes (Section 8.D)

Scenic Highways Six Scenic Highways are designated in the Specific Plan, including two that are, in part, adjacent to the Project Site: Interstate 210 (Osborne Street to the City limits) and La Tuna Canyon Road (Sunland Boulevard to the City limits). Pursuant to Section 4 of the Specific Plan, a "Scenic Highway Corridor" consists of the area extending 500 feet on either side of the centerline of the roadway of each of the Scenic Highways. The following regulations have been applied where applicable to these Scenic Highways:

- The maximum height of the proposed homes will be 30 feet throughout.
- The site does not include any proposed commercial and/or industrial development. Therefore, Section 9.B does not apply here.
- The site does not include any signage that is in conflict with the Specific Plan.

Vista Point Pursuant to the Specific Plan, a "Vista Point" is an area in an existing or future right-of-way of a Scenic Highway as shown on Map No. 1, which has exceptional hillside area views and is set aside for public use (Section 9).

Map No. 1 designates one Vista Point on La Tuna Canyon Road towards the westerly end of the subject property. This portion of La Tuna Canyon Road has extremely steep downward slopes beginning behind the edge of the existing paved roadway. The existing topography does not make it physically practical for the City to provide for the required vista point within the City-owned right-of-way.

A second Vista Point is designated on the Specific Plan Map No. 1 along the Foothill (210) Freeway and Wheatland Avenue. This Vista Point is not located on the Site.

Flood Hazard. The adopted Flood Plain Management Specific Plan identifies areas , which are subject to special/flood hazard/mud flow prone areas or floodways. The Site is not located in an identified special/flood hazard/mud flow prone area or floodway. The project conforms with both the specific provisions and the intent of the Flood Plain Management Specific Plan (Section 5.B.4 of Ordinance 154,405).

2. **The project incorporates mitigation measures when necessary or alternatives identified in the Environmental Review which would mitigate the negative environmental effects of the project to the extent physically feasible.**

On September 7, 2004, the Final EIR (ENV-2002-2481-EIR) for the proposed project was issued by the City. The Final EIR identifies potential environmental impacts and contains recommended mitigation measures to mitigate these impacts. The conditions of approval of VTT 061672 include all feasible mitigation measures from the EIR to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts associated with the project. In approving VTT 61672, the Advisory Agency also considered all alternatives identified in the EIR. The Advisory Agency approved a project ("Approved Project") which is substantially the same as Alternative D: a spread out project with the same circulation pattern, no Public Open space dedication, nor clustering of dwellings.

The EIR also contains a Mitigation Monitoring Program to monitor implementation of all mitigation measures that have been adopted for the proposed project. The project developer is responsible for implementing these mitigation measures and to provide certification to the appropriate monitoring agency and appropriate enforcement agency that compliance with the required mitigation measures has been implemented.

SITE PLAN REVIEW FINDINGS

3. **The Project complies with all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Planning and Zoning Section and any applicable specific plan.**

The Project complies with all provisions of the adopted Specific Plan. No deviations are requested therefrom and none have been approved. As such, the Project has also been issued a Project Permit Compliance Review approval, as required by Specific Plan. The maximum height of all the new homes will be 30 feet throughout the Development Areas, even though the Specific Plan restricts structures to 30 feet in height only within designated "Scenic Highway Corridors". No buildings or structures associated with the Project are situated within any designated Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area, except as allowed by the Specific Plan. In addition, none of the Project's buildings or structures will be

constructed so that the highest point of the roof, structure, or parapet wall is less than 25 vertical feet from the designated Prominent Ridgeline directly above the highest point of the building or structure when located within a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area. Where a Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area is shown on only one side of a Prominent Ridgeline, buildings or structures built on the other side of the Prominent Ridgeline will not break the silhouette of that Prominent Ridgeline. No grading or berming is proposed that would alter the elevation of the crest of any designated Prominent Ridgeline. No native vegetation is proposed to be removed within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area as a result of the Project.

4. The Project is consistent with the General Plan.

The related Vesting Tentative Tract Map has been approved by the Advisory Agency concurrent with Site Plan Review. In making that decision, the Advisory Agency considered the adopted Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan which designates the Property as Minimum Residential, Very Low I Residential and Very Low II Residential. Corresponding to the zoned A1-1, A1-K and RE11-1 Zones. The Letter of Determination of the related-VTTM is narrowly based on consistency with the existing adopted policies and programs of the Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon; and Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plans.

The related-VTTM approval requires the applicant to submit a Revised Map and Modification. At the time of submittal, this Site Plan Review determination will be reviewed also for condition compliance.

The applicant has submitted a request for General Plan Amendments to the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan by which approximately 239 acres of land within the proposed Development Areas that are currently designated Minimum Residential, Very Low I Residential or Very Low II Residential would be changed to Low Residential. Approximately 78 acres of land in the northern subarea of the Site, but outside of proposed Development Area A, that are currently designated Very Low I Residential and Very Low II Residential would be changed to Minimum Residential; and approximately 8 acres of land in the southern subarea of the Site currently designated as Open Space would be changed to Minimum Residential. If Case No. CPC-2004-4344-GPA-ZC is approved, the City would gain a significant amount of dedicated public open space, the community additional equestrian amenities, and development --- while providing additional housing opportunities (280 single-family lots and 75 private/public lots) ---would be confined to specific areas (rather than spread through out the entire ownership) with clear access points to the I-210, avoiding multiple points of access into adjoining residential neighborhoods.

As discussed in the Final EIR, the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan and other elements of the General Plan include certain policies that are generally applicable to the Project. The consistency of the Project with these policies is addressed in Section IV.G (Land Use), pages IV.G-18 through IV.G-24, in the Draft EIR, and Section III(Corrections and Additions), pages III-68 through III-76, in the Final EIR.

5) **The Project is consistent with any applicable adopted redevelopment plan.**

There is no redevelopment plan applicable to the Site.

6) **The Project consists of an arrangement of buildings and structures (including height, bulk and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, load areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collections, and other such pertinent improvements, which is or will be compatible with existing and future developments, which is or will be compatible with existing and future development on the neighboring properties.**

The approval herein is consistent with the Advisory Agency's approval of the related-VTTM which will result in development throughout all 887 acres of the subject site. The scheme or layout of the Approved Related-VTTM is substantially the same as that evaluated as Alternative "D" in the Final EIR. Building heights will be consistent with the requirements of the adopted Specific Plan; no other deviations from the Zoning Code are being sought, nor exceptions to the adopted Specific Plan. Further, no loading areas, off-street parking facilities are proposed. Lighting, trash collection and other pertinent improvements will be consistent with large single family home development. Proposed landscaping will be controlled by both the provisions of the Covenants. Codes and Restrictions (CC&Rs) imposed through the VTTM approval and through mitigation measures for restoration of Oak tree and Sycamore tree habits. Limitations on plant materials are further specified in the Specific Plan. Landform cut and fill grading techniques will be utilized where practical and feasible on the lots designated for single-family homes.

The Project will provide an architectural mix of single-family housing intended to be compatible with the existing mix of housing in the surrounding area, which is situated to the northeast. The Project will be built with gated private streets that will use low-intensity lighting. Each home within the development will include a minimum of two on-site covered parking spaces, and will observe all required yards. In addition, individual homes will not exceed 30 feet in height throughout the Development Areas, even though the Specific Plan's 30-foot height restriction applies only to development that is visible from the right-of-way of a designated Scenic Highway.

This approval also will not result in a major open space dedication nor a three-acre public equestrian park which is proposed adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road in the southwestern portion of the Site under the applicant's request.

However, the Project approved by this determination letter will result substantially more graded areas as well as significant amounts of dirt-export from the site (estimated at 37,000 truck trips); and will convert more natural areas into manufactured slopes. It will result in an additional loss of 29 oak trees; and between fuel modification clearance requirements around new single family home lots and the extended grading pattern, additional naturally vegetated areas will be compromised.

This approval also does not result in a major open space dedication. A three-acre public equestrian park which is proposed adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road in the southwestern portion of the Site under the applicant's request is not included in this approval, although equestrian trails (total square footage of all trails will exceed the 3-acre park area) will be required adjacent to all new roadways within the approved related VTTM.

For the aforementioned reasons, I find that the Approved Project consists of an arrangement of buildings and structures (including height, bulk and setbacks), off-street parking facilities, load areas, lighting, landscaping, trash collections, and other such pertinent improvements, which will be compatible with existing and future development on the neighboring properties.

7. **The Project incorporates feasible mitigation measures, monitoring measures when necessary, or alternatives identified in the environmental review which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the Project, and/or any additional findings as may be required by CEQA.**

On September 7, 2004, the Final EIR was issued by the City. The Final EIR identifies potentially significant environmental impacts and contains recommended mitigation measures to mitigate these impacts. The conditions of approval of the related VTTM include all feasible mitigation measures from the Final EIR to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts associated with the Project. In approving the VTTM, the Advisory Agency also considered all alternatives identified in the Final EIR. The Approved VTTM is substantially consistent with Alternative "D" of the Alternatives Section of the Final EIR. Findings for the Approved Project are attached to this determination and labeled Attachment "A."

The Approved project, like Alternative D, results in a significant number of truck trips -- 37,000 -- to export approximately 740,000 cubic yards of dirt. Finally, the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would reduce one significant environmental impact associated with the Proposed Project to a less-than-significant level:

- Short-term construction noise impact on the existing residential community to the north and northeast.

The Final EIR also includes a Mitigation Monitoring Program to monitor implementation of all environmental mitigation measures that have been adopted for the Project. The project developer is responsible for implementing these mitigation measures and to provide certification to the appropriate monitoring agency and appropriate enforcement agency that compliance with the required mitigation measures has been implemented.

8. The Project uses provide its residents with appropriate type and placement of recreational facilities and service amenities in order to improve habitability for the residents and minimize impacts on neighboring properties. (*For Residential Projects only.)*

The Approved Project – Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61672 -- will result in development throughout all 887 acres of the subject site. The scheme or layout of the approved related-VTTM is substantially the same as that evaluated as Alternative "D" in the Final EIR. Building heights will be consistent with the requirements of the adopted

Specific Plan. Under the existing zoning, equestrian amenities will be available. The approved related-VTTM requires equestrian trails adjacent to all new roadways throughout the site.

The private recreational facilities that will be available for residents of Approved Project are expected to be the same amenities as those for the applicant's requested project: e.g., two lots, active play areas, passive open space areas, a vista point with picnic area and gazebo, and a pool with a jacuzzi, restroom building and barbeque area.

Finally, the payment of Quimby fees to the City will be required as a condition of the VTTM.

Therefore, the Project will provide its residents with appropriate type and placement of recreational facilities and service amenities in order to improve habitability for the residents and minimize impacts on neighboring properties.

9. **Environmental Findings.** On September 7, 2004, the City issued a Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2002091018). Based upon the whole of the environmental record, the public hearing held December 9, 2004, I find that substantial evidence for each and every finding made is

contained in the Draft and Final EIR, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMRP). Further, in accordance with Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, I hereby adopt each of the mitigation measures set forth in the MMRP.

There may be a variety of actions undertaken by other State and local agencies ("responsible agencies" under CEQA). Because the City is the lead agency for the project, the Final EIR is intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other State and local agencies to carry out the Approved Project.

The Final EIR is a Project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the Approved project. A project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The Final EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decision regarding the Approved Project by the City of Los Angeles and other regulatory jurisdictions.

I hereby certify the Final EIR for, and approve and adopt findings for the entirely of the actions described in the findings and in the Final EIR, Statement of Overriding Considerations and MMRP as comprising the Approved project.

The records upon which this decision is based are located in the Department of City Planning, Environmental Section, Room 750, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-2601

CON HOWE
Director of Planning

Emily Gabel-Luddy
Deputy Advisory Agency

CC: Councilmember Wendy Greuel, 2nd District
Department of Building and Safety
Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council
Sunland-Tujunga Neighborhood Council
Adjacent Property Owners
Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

EGL:FT:jh

Attachment "A:" CEQA Findings, Alternatives, Statement of Overriding Considerations

ATTACHMENT A
FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61672 AND CPC-2004-4345-SPP-SPR DETERMINATION DATED JANUARY 4, 2005

Requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the City of Los Angeles Department of Planning prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies and other interested parties on September 6, 2002. The NOP was circulated for a period of 30 days, until October 7, 2002. All NOP comments relating to the Draft EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

On October 2, 2003, the City released the Draft EIR for public comment. The comment period was 90 days, ending on December 31, 2003. Detailed written responses were prepared to the comments received on the Draft EIR. The comments on the Draft EIR, and the responses to those comments, are included in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project (collectively, with the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices A through M thereto, the "Final EIR").

A reasonable range of five alternatives to the Project was analyzed, including the potential effects of the "No Project" alternative. Following the close of the public review period,

The Draft EIR evaluated in detail the potential effects of the Project and analyzed the cumulative impact analyses in the Final EIR are based on the related projects identified in Section II.C (Related Projects) of the Draft EIR and Section IV (Responses to Comments), pages IV-37 through IV-57 (Topical Response 7) in the Final EIR. The Final EIR, which was published on September 7, 2004, also includes an updated summary, corrections and additions to the text of the Draft EIR, a mitigation monitoring program and Technical Appendices A through J.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City's CEQA findings are based are located at the Planning Department, Environmental Review Section, 200 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012-2601. This information is provided in compliance with Section 21081.6(a)(2) of the California Public Resources Code.

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines (the "Guidelines") require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more of three possible findings for each of the significant impacts.

A. The first possible finding is that "[c]hanges or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (Guidelines, § 15091(a)(1))

B. The second possible finding is that "[s]uch changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (Guidelines, § 15091(a)(2))

C. The third possible finding is that "[s]pecific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (Guidelines, § 15091(a)(3))

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final EIR for the Approved Project.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project proposes the development of 280 single-family homes, a three-acre public equestrian park and the preservation of approximately 693 acres of open space. The proposed single-family homes would be clustered on approximately 194 acres of the 887-acre Site, which is located at 7000-8000 La Tuna Canyon Road in the City.

211 homes would be constructed on approximately 142 acres of land in Development Area A, north of Interstate 210, and 69 homes would be constructed on approximately 52 acres of land on Development Area B, south of Interstate 210 (Development Area A and Development Area B are collectively defined herein as the "Development Areas").

Approximately 693 acres (78 percent) of the Site, including large swaths of land west of the proposed homes, would be preserved as open space. The Project also includes an equestrian park on approximately three acres of land adjacent to La Tuna Canyon Road in the southwestern portion of the Site, which would be available for public use. Additional private recreational facilities would be provided throughout the Site, including tot lots, active play areas, passive open space areas, a vista point with picnic area and gazebo, and a pool with a jacuzzi, restroom building and barbeque area. One or more homeowners' associations (collectively, the "Association(s)") would be established to own and maintain these recreational facilities and the open space areas requiring maintenance.

The proposed homes would average approximately 4,000 square feet in size, on lots ranging from 9,038 to 64,827 square feet. The 211 homes proposed in Development Area A and the 69 homes proposed in Development Area B would include a variety of lot sizes and a variety of architectural styles.

All proposed development would be located on the portion of the Site within the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan area. The entire portion of the Site located in the Sun Valley Community Plan area (approximately 250 acres) would be preserved as open space.

Construction of the Project is anticipated to begin in 2005, with completion by the end of 2009.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPROVED PROJECT

The Advisory Agency has approved a project for 175 lots to be spread across the entire 887 acres under ownership of the applicant in the form of 5-acre "ranchettes." The project will have multiple access points to Development Area A, including two access points through the existing residential communities to the north and northeast. On the southern portion of the site, multiple access points will be provided along La Tuna Canyon Road. In consideration of the Approved Project, the Advisory Agency finds that the environmental effects have been properly identified under Alternative D of the FEIR for impacts. Certain impacts will change – those related to the effect of an increased residential population – while others will remain the same – those related to extent of grading, disturbance of additional native vegetation and habitat, longer roads, larger cut and fill slopes, greater extend of fuel modification zones.

While Alternative D evaluates the potential affects of an 87-lot subdivision; the acreage, layout and proposed building site areas for Alternative D will remain substantially the same if the density is doubled from 87 to 175 single family residences. These residences will likely share building pad areas, although some additional grading may be required. Therefore, except as described below, the potential impacts associated with the Approved Project are substantially the same as Alternative D.

In making the subsequent findings, any reference to the "Proposed Project," is that which the applicant requested. Any reference to the "Approved Project" is that which the Advisory Agency approved. References to "Alternative D" where they appear mean that the Advisory Agency sets forth those findings as the findings for the Approved Project without change.

IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The Department of City Planning determined that the Approved Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts in the area of Agricultural Resources. Therefore, this issue area was not examined in the Final EIR. The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact would occur is summarized below:

Agricultural Resources

Although the Development Areas within the Site are currently zoned A1 (Agricultural), no agricultural activities currently occur on the Site. In addition, the Site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation. The Approved Project would not conflict with a Williamson Act Contract and would not involve other changes to the existing environment which, due to location or nature, could result in the conversion of existing farmland to non-agricultural use.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The Approved Project will have the same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. It would occupy the same 887-acre site and would be exposed to the same general conditions as the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Approved Project could result in significant impacts due to potential for rock fall, landslides and cut slopes. In addition, since Alternative D would include development of land that would otherwise be preserved as open space under the proposed project, it is conceivable that the development of the Alternative D could involve unforeseen geotechnical conditions. However, if adverse geotechnical conditions are encountered, the layout of larger lots could be refined to accommodate or rectify those conditions.

In addition, existing geotechnical conditions for the entire project site are evaluated and presented in Section IV.A (Geology and Soils) of the Draft EIR. As discussed in Section IV.A (Geology and Soils), 11 landslides were identified on the project site. While the Proposed Project would expose future homes to seven landslides, this Approved Project would potentially expose future homes to all 11 landslides.

However, similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of the recommended mitigation measures (See Section IV.A Geology and Soils) would reduce potentially significant impacts from geology and soils to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, impacts from geology and soils under Alternative D, would be similar to the Proposed Project. However, because of its reduced density, fewer people and structure would be exposed to geotechnical hazards under Alternative D, than under the Proposed Project.

AIR QUALITY

The Approved Project will have the same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Alternative D would involve approximately 50 percent of the excavation quantities required for the proposed Project. Therefore, construction-related air quality impacts of Alternative D could be reduced by a similar ratio. However, this reduction in on-site vehicle emissions would be partially offset by the necessity to export approximately 740,000 cubic yards of excess fill from the project site.

Upon project occupancy, Alternative D would generate less residents and vehicles trips, and these operational air quality impacts would be expected to be less than the less-than-significant operational air quality impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

ARTIFICIAL LIGHT AND GLARE

The Approved Project will have substantially same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. However, the Approved Project results in more residences and therefore more light sources dispersed over the 887acre site. Alternative D would implement a lighting plan comparable to that of the Proposed Project. As a result, Alternative D can be expected to result in fewer residential sources of night lighting on the project site. However, larger homes that would be provided under Alternative D would be expected to generate more light than the smaller homes under the proposed project. Furthermore, it is expected that low levels of street lighting would be provided on all internal circulation roadways for security

and identification purposes. Because of the dispersed nature of this alternative and the more extensive internal roadway system, this alternative would generate low levels of night lighting throughout the 887-acre project site. Because lighting under Alternative D would be more visible from Interstate 210, impacts would be considered significant and greater than for the Proposed Project. Impacts to La Tuna Canyon Road would also be significant and greater than the Proposed Project. Impacts to the existing residential community to the north and northeast would be reduced from the proposed Project due to a lower intensity development. Because major portions of the 887-acre project site would be subject to night lighting, night lighting impacts under Alternative D would be greater then for the Proposed Project.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Although the Approved Project would only involve the construction of 175 homes (or 37.5 percent less than the Proposed Project), there would not be a comparable reduction in runoff generated during a 50-year storm. This is due to the fact that impermeable surface area is the major factor in generating increased runoff, not the number of homes.

It is estimated that the Approved Project (because it essentially proposes the same layout as Alternative D), like Alternative D, would have approximately 43.17 acres of impermeable surface area (due primarily to more extensive internal roads, longer driveways, larger homes, and larger patios and other hardscape areas). This is approximately 6.43 acres (or 13 percent) less impermeable surface area than the Proposed Project (i.e., 49.6 acres). Consequently, the amount of runoff generated by Alternative D, above and beyond the undeveloped conditions peak flows, would be approximately 13 percent less than that generated by the Proposed Project. However, the design goal of the Proposed Project's storm drainage system is to reduce peak runoff flows during a 50-year storm to 90 percent of peak runoff from the undeveloped site. This would be achieved by sizing the detention basins accordingly. The same flow discharged into the La Tuna Canyon Wash could be achieved under Alternative D by adjusting the release of storm water flows from its detention basins. Hence, the resulting downstream impacts from Alternative D and the Proposed Project would be essentially the same.

Implementation of BMPs for both the construction and operational phases would ensure that the Proposed Project would not generate significant water quality impacts. Alternative D would provide comparable water quality BMPs as the Proposed Project. Hence, the resulting water quality impacts from Alternative D and the Proposed Project would be essentially the same.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Flora and Fauna
The Approved Project will have substantially same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Under Alternative D, approximately 450.02 acres of the project site would be disturbed and potentially impact biological resources. As set forth in Table VI-4, compared to the Proposed Project, Alternative D would increase habitat disturbance by approximately 145.25 acres (450.02 – 304.77). The 450.02 acres consist of:

(1) approximately 225.54 acres affected by grading and not revegetated;
(2) approximately 82.81 acres subject to brush clearance; and
(3) approximately 142.73 acres that would be subject to 50 percent impact associated with brush thinning within the fuel modification zone.

An additional 14.09 acres would be subject to remedial grading, but would be revegetated with native species following remedial grading and would be preserved as natural open space.

Alternative D would have substantially greater impacts to native vegetation on the project site than the Proposed Project. Regarding impacts to areas subject to Corps and CDFG jurisdiction and to non-jurisdictional riparian areas, all such areas, with the exception of Drainage 2 (La Tuna Canyon Wash), would be potentially impacted with implementation of Alternative D. A total of 0.95 acres of Corps jurisdiction, 1.50 acres of CDFG jurisdiction and 8.66 acres of non-jurisdictional riparian areas would be potentially impacted under Alternative D. Drainage 2 would not be impacted because it is shielded from the proposed lots by topography and ownership boundaries. In comparison, 2.06 acres of Corps jurisdiction, 2.45 acres of CDFG jurisdiction and 2.32 acres of non-jurisdictional areas would be impacted under the Proposed Project (see Section IV.D.1 (Flora and Fauna). Although impacts to Corps and CDFG jurisdictional areas would be less under Alternative D compared to the proposed project, there is a potential for the private owners of the proposed lots to disturb additional jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional areas.on their properties. The impact to 8.66 acres of non-jurisdictional riparian areas under Alternative D substantially exceeds the impact to 2.32 acres of non-jurisdictional riparian areas under the Proposed Project.

Native Trees
Grading under Approved Project is substantially the same as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Alternative D would require the removal of up to 260 (or approximately 21 percent) of the 1,247 surveyed and estimated coast live oaks on the project site. Grading under Alternative D would require the removal of up to 30 (or approximately 22.5 percent) of the 133 surveyed and estimated western sycamores on the project site. In comparison, the Proposed Project would require the removal of up to 232 coast live oaks and 27 western sycamores. Thus, impacts to native trees would be greater under Alternative D than under the Proposed Project. However, similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed in Section IV.D.2 (Native Trees) of this Draft EIR would reduce the long-term impact to coast live oaks to a less-than significant level, while the short-term impact on coast live oaks would remain significant after mitigation.

Wildlife Movement
The Approved Project will have substantially same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Although Alternative D and the Proposed Project would occupy the same 887-acre project site, development under this alternative would extend across the entire project site, while the Proposed Project would be limited to Development Areas. As discussed in Section IV.D.3 (Wildlife Movement), the Proposed Project does not affect potential regional wildlife movement between the Tujunga Wash and the main body of the Verdugo Mountains south of La Tuna Canyon Road because, if an animal can successfully navigate the "Missing Link" area south of Tujunga Wash and make its way to the northwestern portion of the project site, it can travel undisturbed through the western potion of the project site to La Tuna

Canyon Road. That route would likely include travel through Drainage 14, as discussed in Section IV.D.3.

However, Alternative D could potentially impact Drainage 14.

In addition, many of the proposed homes in the western portion of the project site under Alternative D would likely be surrounded by fences. As a result, if and to the extent regional wildlife movement currently occurs via Tujunga Wash, the potential impacts to Drainage 14 and the potential fencing could, to some extent, restrict regional wildlife movement south of Interstate 210. However, given the relatively small number of homes proposed on the western portion of the project site south of Interstate 210, it is not anticipated that Alternative D would have a significant impact on such regional wildlife movement or have a materially greater impact on regional wildlife movement than the Proposed Project. The only local wildlife movement corridor that would be potentially impacted by Alternative D would be Drainage 14, as discussed above. Therefore, impacts on local wildlife movement under Alternative D would be somewhat greater than those associated with the Proposed Project, but potential impacts to one of several local movement corridors currently available to animals would not be considered significant.

NOISE

The Approved Project will have substantially same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Under Alternative D, grading would involve only half the volume of excavation as the proposed project, fewer homes would be constructed, and construction would be dispersed over the entire project site (rather than being clustered in the eastern portion of the property). Furthermore, north of Interstate 210, the majority of the construction that would occur under Alternative D would be located farther away from the existing residential community to the north and northeast than the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative D would be expected to have a reduced construction noise impact on the existing residential community to the north and northeast.

Alternative D would also reduce overall noise impacts south of Interstate 210. Grading volumes would be reduced, fewer homes would be constructed, and the construction would be dispersed over a large area (see Figure VI-4). Therefore, Alternative D would be expected to have a reduced noise impact for visitors to La Tuna Canyon Park. Compared to the Proposed Project, Alternative D would increase grading and construction noise audible at the existing homes located along La Tuna Canyon Road. However, the substantial distance and intervening terrain between the proposed grading and the existing homes would be expected to attenuate these noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Due to the necessity to export 740,000 cubic yards from the project site (approximately 37,000 two-way truck trips), Alternative D would generate substantial truck noise in the surrounding that would not occur under the Proposed Project. Although the noise impacts associated with potential blasting with respect to the Proposed Project is not expected to be significant, Alternative D would involve less total grading and would therefore further reduce the necessity for blasting and its resultant noise.

As discussed in the Section IV.E (Noise), under the Proposed Project, 20 homes would be subject to noise levels of 67 dBA or greater, which presents a potentially significant

impact. Of these, noise impacts to all but three homes could be mitigated to less than significant levels. Under Alternative D, approximately 17 homes would be subject to noise levels of 67 dBA or greater. It is expected that impacts to a majority of these homes could be mitigated with sound walls and/or berms, similar to the Proposed Project. However, if some of these homes in Alternative D could not be protected in this manner, modification to the site plan could be required, similar to the proposed project. While long-term operational noise levels under the Proposed Project would be less than significant, operational noise levels under Alternative D would be even lower due to the alternative's lower density and more dispersed design.

LAND USE

The Approved Project will have substantially same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. Currently, approximately 748 acres (84 percent) of the project site has a Minimum Residential land use designation, as set forth in the Sunland-Tujunga and Sun Valley Community Plans (see Figure IV.G-1 in Section IV.G (Land Use)). The remaining 139 acres (16 percent) of the project site is designated as Open Space (nine acres), Very Low I Residential (120 acres) and Very Low II Residential (10 acres) land uses. The development of single-family homes on land with these land use designations are subject to the requirements of the City's slope density ordinance (see Section 17.05C of the LAMC).

As indicated in Figure IV.G-4 in Section IV.G (Land Use), approximately 860 acres (97 percent) of the project site is zoned A1-1 (Agricultural, Height District No. 1). The remaining 27 acres (three percent) of the project site is zoned A1-K-1 (Agricultural, Height District No. 1, Equinekeeping District) and RE-11 (Residential Estate, Height District No. 1). The current land use and zoning designations for the project site and the City's slope density ordinance all limit the number of single-family homes that can currently be developed on the project site. After consideration of the 87-lot alternative, the Advisory Agency reviewed, considered and approved a slope density study over the 887-acres that was performed consistent with the requirements of the slope density ordinance and procedures and confirmed that 175 single-family homes were permitted on the project site. A copy of this study is located in the Tract file.

The Approved Project, like Alternative D, does not include any proposed changes to the existing land use and zoning designations for the project site. The Approved Project, like Alternative D is designed for consistency with the adopted San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan. As discussed above (see Biological Resources). The Approved Project, like Alternative D, would result in impacts to a greater number of oak trees than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, compliance with the City's Oak Tree Ordinance would be required with implementation of this alternative. Regarding community division, this alternative would be developed on the same project site as the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, implementation of this alternative would not physically divide an established community (see Community Division discussion in Section IV.G (Land Use)). For the reasons discussed above, implementation of Alternative D would further reduce the less-than-significant land use impacts resulting from the Proposed Project.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The Approved Project results in slightly more than twice the number of people and residences analyzed under Alternative D (267 vs. 534 people; and 87 houses vs. 175 houses). Therefore the environmental effects of the Approved Project will be generally twice that of Alternative D. These Findings have been modified where appropriate to reflect the potential environmental effects of the Approved Project.

Development would occur on the same project site as the proposed project. Currently, the project site is undeveloped and does not contain any homes or people. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Approved Project would not result in the displacement of any existing homes or people. Based on the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan estimate of 3.07 persons per Minimum single-family home (Note: varies from the factor of 2.97 persons per low-density single-family home used to calculate future population under the Proposed Project), approximately 534 people are expected to occupy 175 single-family homes upon completion of construction. This is approximately 297 less people and 105 fewer homes than would occur with the Proposed Project. As indicated in Section IV.H (Population and Housing) of this Draft EIR, the increases in population and housing resulting from the proposed project are not expected to directly induce substantial population growth. The Approved Project would result in the introduction of fewer residents and homes than the Proposed Project, the less-than-significant population and housing impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be reduced under this alternative.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

The Approved Project will approximately double the number of trips from that of Alternative D; although the circulation patterns will remain the same as Alternative D.

Traffic volumes expected to be generated under the Approved Project were estimated using rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation manual, 6th Edition, 1997. Traffic volumes expected to be generated by Alternative D, as with the Proposed Project, were forecast based on the number of single-family homes. As shown in Table IV-5, Alternative D is expected to generate 65 vehicle trips (16 inbound and 49 outbound) during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, Alternative D is expected to generate 88 vehicle trips (56 inbound and 32 outbound). Over a 24-hour period, Alternative D is forecast to generate 833 daily trip ends during a typical weekday.

Approved Project vs. Alternative D Trip Generation a

Land Use	Size	Daily End trips b	AM Peak IN	AM Peak OUT	TOTAL	PM Peak IN	PM Peak OUT	TOTAL
Approved Project Single Family c	175	1666	32	98	130	112	64	176
Alternative D Single Family c	87	833	16	49	65	56	32	88

a Source: ITE "Trip Generation", 6 th Edition, 1997.
b Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.
c ITE Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Residential) trip generation average rates.

The Approved Project will generate more trips per day at the AM and PM Peak Hours than Alternative D. It is forecast to generate approximately 35 percent fewer daily, AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips when compared to the Proposed Project (the Proposed Project was forecast to generate 2,694 daily vehicle trips, 212 AM peak hour trips and 284 PM peak hour trips). Although fewer vehicle trips are anticipated to travel through the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours with the development of the Approved Project, the distribution of traffic through the study intersections would be different than the Proposed Project due to the significant changes in access to and from Development Areas A and B.

Determination of the "Gateway" Traffic Volumes
The Approved Project will have substantially the same impacts as Alternative D and the findings for Alternative D are therefore incorporated as follows. As stated above, the access scheme associated with Alternative D varies significantly from the Proposed Project in that more access points are provided. In addition, the internal roadways on either portion of the project site in Alternative D do not provide access to all of the lots (i.e., an internal roadway may only provide access to two or three lots). Alternative D provides four access points with connections to the adjacent residential streets to the north. In comparison, the Proposed Project has no vehicular access to and from the adjacent residential streets north of Development Area A (except for emergency access.

The environmental effects on the Gateway Access Points under the Approved Project are as follows:

The Gateway A access point ties into Verdugo Crestline Drive (which joins with Sherman Grove Avenue to access Foothill Boulevard) and would serve approximately 26 of the 175 lots. The Gateway B access point connects with Verdugo Crestline Drive (which joins Hillhaven Avenue and Alene Drive to access Foothill Boulevard) and would serve approximately 46 of the 175 lots. The Gateway C access point ties into Inspiration Way (which joins Alene Drive and Hillhaven Avenue to access FoothillBoulevard) and would serve approximately four of the 87 lots. The Gateway D access point ties into the adjacent residential area to the north near Hillhaven Avenue (which provides access to Foothill Boulevard) and would serve approximately 6 lots. The Gateway E access point ties into La Tuna Canyon Road and would serve two of the 87 lots. The Gateway F, G, H and I access points tie into La Tuna Canyon Road and would serve approximately 4, 6, 32 and 48 lots, respectively. It should be noted that the Gateway B, C and D access points all tie into roadways (i.e., Verdugo Crestline Drive and Inspiration Way) which join Alene Drive and Hillhaven Avenue prior to connecting with Foothill Boulevard. Therefore, Approved Project traffic, like Alternative D traffic, associated with Gateways B, C, and D is expected to merge at some point between Foothill Boulevard and the gateway access points.

Residential Street Segment Impact Analysis
Based on a review of the proposed site access scheme, the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would increase traffic on residential streets located adjacent to and north of Development Area A. In order to assess the potential for significant transportation impacts along these street segments, the traffic consultant used the residential street segment criteria contained in the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT's) Traffic Study Policies and Procedures, approved in November, 1993. Those criteria are based on the projected increase in the average daily traffic (ADT) volumes

due to the construction and occupancy of a proposed project (e.g., due to the development of Alternative D).

Current 24-hour ADT counts are not available for any of the residential streets located north of Development Area A. However, based on a review of the existing characteristics of these residential areas, it is the traffic consultant's professional opinion that the existing residential streets (at certain points between Foothill Boulevard and the Alternative D Gateways A, B, C, and D) currently carry between 1,000 and 2,000 vehicles per day, although the adjacent residential streets carry fewer than 1,000 vehicles per day on those street segments nearest the Gateway access points (i.e., where only a small number of residential homes are served). The street segments located closer to Foothill Boulevard are likely to accommodate closer to 2,000 vehicles per day.

A significant transportation impact is forecast for residential street segments which carry between 1,000 and 2,000 ADT when the project-related increase in ADT corresponds to 12 percent or more of the ADT. Thus, Alternative D is likely to result in significant transportation impacts on those residential street segments located north of Development Area A which carry 1,000 or more vehicles per day and where Alternative D would add 120 or more daily vehicle trips. The threshold of 120 daily vehicle trips corresponds to the development of 12 or more single-family residential lots. It is likely that at least two street segments between the Gateway A and B access points and Foothill Boulevard would be significantly impacted by Alternative D because the ADT counts for those street segments are 124 and 220, which exceed the 120 ADT threshold. Because the Approved Project will utilize the same traffic circulation system as Alternative D, with twice the number of permitted lots, it is likely that these Gateway Points will be impacted at twice the rate.

Conclusions
Based on the LADOT residential street segment impact criteria and Alternative D's daily vehicular trip generation forecast at each access point (i.e., "gateway"), it is concluded that at least two street segments between Gateways A and B and Foothill Boulevard could be expected to be significantly impacted by Alternative D; and further impacted by the Approved Project. With respect to La Tuna Canyon Road, the Approved Project includes the development of 94 homes (vs. 47 homes of Alternative D) that would access La Tuna Canyon Road south of Interstate 210. In comparison, 69 homes would access La Tuna Canyon Road south of Interstate 210 under the Proposed Project. As discussed in Section IV.I(Transportation/Traffic), the traffic impact on La Tuna Canyon Road from homes in Development Area B would be less than significant. Therefore, the traffic impact on La Tuna Canyon Road south of Interstate 210 under Alternative D and the Approved Project would also be less than significant because fewer homes would generate fewer trips (as compared to the Proposed Project).

PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire Protection
By reducing the number of homes on the project site by 35 percent, the Approved Project would theoretically decrease demand for fire protection and emergency services provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department by approximately 35 percent. However, fire hazards to homes and occupants in the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would probably increase due to their greater isolation and distance from project site access

points. Similar to the Proposed Project, Alternative D would include automatic fire sprinkler systems for all structures to compensate for excessive response distance impacts. However, response times to some homes under Alternative D would be substantially greater due to the dispersed nature of the subdivision. Evacuation from the project site under Alternative D would be more difficult and time consuming for the same reasons, even though there would be fewer people trying to evacuate the project site. Therefore, should a wildfire occur, homes developed under Alternative D would be subjected to greater fire hazards and demands on the Fire Department would be substantially increased.

Police Protection

The Approved Project, like Alternative D, would theoretically decrease the Proposed Project's demand for police protection services proportionate to the decrease in number of homes. However, while the Proposed Project includes significant crime prevention design features that substantially reduce demands for police protection services compared to a typical subdivision, the dispersed nature of the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would make such design features less effective. For example, clustering homes permits mutual surveillance from adjoining homes while reducing opportunities for concealment by potential intruders. In comparison, the more isolated nature of the homes developed under Alternative D does not lend itself to mutual surveillance or assistance, and it increases the potential for unobserved criminal activities. In addition, the more extensive roadways under the Approved Project, like Alternative D, may increase police response times. Consequently, the isolated character of the homes spread over the entire acreage, in combination with less opportunity for community oriented crime prevention design features, potentially results in a development more susceptible to home-oriented crimes and somewhat increased demand for police protection services.

Recreation and Parks

Based on the preferred parkland per population ratio of four acres per 1,000 persons, the Approved Project, at twice the density of Alternative D, would require 2.0 acres of new parkland, compared to the 3.3 acres of new parkland required by the Proposed Project. The Approved Project will be required to pay appropriate Quimby fees to satisfy the need for any new or physically altered parks or recreational facilities in order to maintain current service ratios. Therefore, the Approved Project's impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project includes a total of 4.7 acres of recreational facilities, including a three-acre public Equestrian Park and 1.7 acres of active recreational facilities for children, youth and adults. In addition, the demand for parks and recreational facilities in the area of the Project would be offset by more than 700 acres of preserved open space on the Site. Although the Approved Project includes requirements for equestrian trails equal to or greater than the total square footage of the Equestrian Park (e.g. more than 3 acres worth of trails will be located adjacent to or near the Approved Project roadways), no further community oriented recreational facilities would be provided by the Approved Project, just like Alternative D: no Equestrian Staging Area, no Open Space dedication. The homes under the Approved Project would have large lots (5 acres in size) and building pads (averaging 0.50 acre in size) with substantial opportunity for private recreational facilities, but any such private facilities would not compensate for this alternative's demand for public recreational facilities. However, payment of required

Quimby fees would be expected to reduce the impact on public recreational facilities to a less-than-significant level.

Libraries
The Approved Project, like Alternative D, would reduce the Proposed Project's demand for library services and facilities – but to a lesser extent due to increased density. More specifically, the Approved Project would generate demand for approximately 258 square feet of additional library space and 1,034 additional volumes of permanent collection. The demand on increased library services is considered less than significant, the same as Alternative D (and the Proposed Project).

Schools
Alternative D would reduce the Proposed Project's demand for school services and facilities by approximately 69 percent. The Approved Project reduces the demand by approximately 35 percent due to its increase in overall density. The Approved Project alternative would generate a total of 74 students, spread among elementary, middle and high school age. The impacts on school facilities would be less than significant.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Electricity
The Approved Project would generate approximately twice the energy demand as Alternative D: 2,682 kilowatt hours vs. 1,341 kilowatt hours. This is determined to be a less than significant impact.

Natural Gas
The Approved Project would generate approximately twice the natural gas demand as Alternative D: 38, 128 cubic feet of natural gas vs. 19,064 cubic feet of natural gas per day. The Approved Project's impact on natural gas services would be less than significant

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Water
The Approved Project would consume approximately twice the water demand as Alternative D: approximately 68,904 gallons of water per day vs. 34,452 gallons of water per day (gpd). The impact on water availability would be less than significant.

Sewer
The Approved Project would generate approximately twice the sewage as Alternative D: approximately 57,420 gallons of sewage per day vs. 28,710 gallons of sewage per day (gpd). The Approved Project and Alternative D would require the extension of existing sewer facilities to the project site. Therefore, off-site construction impacts would be the same for Alternative D and the Proposed Project. Like the Approved Project, Alternative D would disperse development across the entire 887-acre project site, and therefore, would require more on-site construction of sewer lines than the proposed project. However, since onsite sewer lines would be located within the new onsite access roads and would be constructed at the same time as the roads, no additional impacts from construction of the sewer lines would occur. Impacts resulting from the expansion of sewer facilities would be less than significant.

Solid Waste
The Approved Project would generate approximately twice the solid waste as Alternative D: 2,128 vs. 1,064 pounds of solid waste daily. The Approved Project, like Alternative D, permits horse keeping. The City provides waste disposal bins for horse keeping waste for off-site haul to composting sites, and therefore the generation of horse manure will have no effect on landfill sites. For the Approved Project, like Alternative D, construction-related and operational impacts on landfill capacities would be less than significant.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Site Assessment
The Phase I ESA that was conducted for the Proposed Project assessed the condition of the entire project site. Since the Approved Project, like Alternative D, is the same project site, and the land uses (i.e. single family) are the same, the Phase I ESA would equally apply to the Approved Project and Alternative D. Therefore, the analysis contained in Section IV.M.1 (Environmental Site Assessment) of this Draft EIR with respect to the Proposed Project would equally apply to the Approved Project and Alternative D. As indicated therein, impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts under the Approved Project would also be less than significant.

Electromagnetic Field Emissions
As shown in Figure VI-3, fewer homes would be located in close proximity to the SCE transmission lines under Alternative D than with implementation of the Proposed Project. However, as discussed in Section IV.M.2 (Electromagnetic Field Emissions) of this Draft EIR, there is insufficient scientific evidence to demonstrate any causal link between EMF exposure from transmission lines or any other source and adverse health effects. Similar to the Proposed Project, the impact with respect to EMF exposure under Alternative D would be less than significant. However, in the interest of full disclosure with respect to the scientific community's uncertainty of potential health risks associated with EMF exposure, the mitigation measure in Section IV.M.2 (Electromagnetic Field Emissions) is recommended.

AESTHETICS

Alternative D includes low-density housing across the entire 887-acre project site (average lot size of 10.2 acres). The resulting aesthetic effect would be a sense of the loss of open space and the conversion of the project site to low-density housing. In addition to the proposed homes and the meandering internal circulation roadways, horse corals, fencing, vegetation removal and the like would further transform the appearance of the project site. In contrast with the Proposed Project, which would cluster development into the two Development Areas in the eastern portion of the project site, Alternative D would spread development out over the entire property. Under the Proposed Project, development would be concentrated in the Development Areas and thereby preserve large expanses of open space (i.e., approximately 693 acres). Like Alternative D, development under the Approved Project would occur at a much lower density, but the contiguous open space would be lost. The Proposed Project and the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would significantly impact Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road, the two scenic highways from which the project site can be viewed. However, like Alternative D, the Approved Project would transform the entire 887-acre

project site, while development of the Proposed Project would largely be limited to the 194-acre Development Areas and the three-acre equestrian park. Consequently, the Approved Project, like Alternative D would have a greater impact on the area's scenic vistas than would the Proposed Project and would more substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings.

CULTURAL RESOURCES (HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

The Proposed Project would have no adverse effects on known historic, archaeological or paleontological resources on the project site because there are no known such resources with in the Development Areas. Development under the Approved Project or Alternative D would occur on the same project site as the Proposed Project. Therefore, similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would not result in impacts to any known historic, archaeological or paleontological resources.

APPROVED PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP TO PROPOSED PROJECT'S OBJECTIVES

The Approved Project would not satisfy all of the project objectives because it would result in the development of substantially fewer homes with fewer recreational facilities and no preservation of open space. The Approved Project, substantially the same as Alternative D, will have the same relationship to Project Objectives.

Specifically, the Approved Project or Alternative D would not:

- Provide a substantial amount of high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future housing needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and help to alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City.
- Permanently preserve over 75 percent of the project site as open space.
- Provide ample equestrian and other recreational amenities, as well as significant passive open space and landscaping areas.
- Provide safe, efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential development with convenient connections to adjoining arterials and freeways, while minimizing traffic impacts on existing residential neighborhoods.
- Minimize impacts to important natural landforms and significant natural resources.
- Develop a residential project on the project site that is financially viable and thereby permits (1) the donation or dedication of all of the project site located outside the Development Areas to an appropriate public agency or nonprofit entity and (2) the development of public and private equestrian and other recreational amenities on the project site.

The Approved Project, which consists of 175 homes, is similar to Alternative D. It would result in a substantially smaller number of homes than would be developed under the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Approved Project, like Alternative D, would satisfy the following project objectives, although to a lesser extent than the Proposed Project:

- Provide regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs of the region.
- Invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business opportunities associated with the construction, use and occupancy of the project site.

The Approved Project, like Alternative D, would satisfy the following project objectives:

- Establish a low-density residential community that avoids the crowded appearance of a typical subdivision.
- Provide a peaceful, attractive residential development within the context of the surrounding man-made and natural environment, and separate and shield the development to maximize environmental and land use compatibility with surrounding uses.
- Locate the residential development in proximity to existing infrastructure and services where possible.

Reduction of Significant Project Impacts
The Proposed Project would result in the following significant environmental impacts after mitigation: construction emissions, construction noise, artificial light, scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and short-term effects on coast live oak trees. The Approved Project, like Alternative D, would reduce one significant environmental impact associated with the Proposed Project to a less-than-significant level:

- Short-term construction noise impact on the existing residential community to the north and northeast.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

The Final EIR considered a range of alternatives to the Proposed Project to permit informed decision-making in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with CEQA requirements, the alternatives to the Proposed Project include a "No Project" alternative and alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening one or more significant effects associated with the Project. The alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR include: (A) No Project Alternative; (B) Development Area A Only (280 Homes); (C) Duke Property Alternative Access (280 Homes); (D) Reduced Density Alternative (87 Homes); and (E) Reduced Density Alternative (210 Homes). These alternatives and their impacts, which are summarized below, are more fully described in Chapter VI (Alternatives) of the Draft EIR and Section III (Corrections and Additions), pages III-112 through III-117, in the Final EIR.

Alternative A: No Project

Description of the Alternative.

Under Alternative A, the Proposed Project would not be constructed and the Site would remain in its current condition. This alternative would produce no change to the existing physical condition and use of the Site. Accordingly, this Alternative would be equivalent to the site conditions discussed under "Environmental Setting" for each category analyzed in the Final EIR.

Impact Summary of the Alternative.

Alternative A would reduce all of the significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project following mitigation to a less-than-significant level. These include construction emissions, construction noise, artificial light, scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and short-term effects on coast live oak trees.

Findings.

The significant impacts that would occur with the Proposed Project would not occur with Alternative A. However, it is found pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative A.

Rationale for Findings.

The No Project Alternative would avoid all of the significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. However, the No Project Alternative would not satisfy most of the Proposed Project's objectives identified in the Final EIR because no development would occur on the Site. The No Project Alternative would not provide a substantial amount of high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future housing needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and would not help to alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City. The No Project Alternative also would not permanently preserve over 75 percent of the Site as open space or provide ample equestrian and other recreational amenities, as well as significant passive open space and landscaping areas. In addition, it would not result in the development of a residential project on the Site that is financially viable and thereby permits (a) the donation or dedication of most of the Site located outside the Development Areas to an appropriate public agency or nonprofit entity and (b) the development of public and private equestrian and other recreational amenities on the Site. Instead, the No Project Alternative would satisfy only one project objective – it would minimize impacts to important natural landforms and significant natural resources. Alternative A is infeasible and less desirable than the Proopsed Project because it would not achieve important project objectives and, therefore, the City rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

Alternative B: Development Area A Only, 280 Lots

Description of the Alternative.

Under Alternative B, 280 single-family homes would be developed on the north side of Interstate 210 within the boundaries of Development Area A and no development would occur south of Interstate 210. In order to develop the same number of homes in a smaller area, the lots and the homes constructed would be smaller than for the Proposed or Approved Project. Alternative B would preserve 98.67 more acres of natural open space than the Project (680.83 – 582.16).

Impact Summary of the Alternative.

By eliminating all significant impacts associated with the development of proposed Development Area B, Alternative B would substantially lessen several of the significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project, including (a) construction air quality impacts, (b) construction noise impacts with respect to Development Area B, (c) artificial light impact on La Tuna Canyon Road, (d) impacts on non-jurisdictional riparian habitat and coast live oak trees and (e) scenic vistas of, scenic resources in and the visual character of Development Area B as viewed from Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road. However, Alternative B would have significant environmental impacts after mitigation that are greater than the Proposed Project with respect to (1) construction noise impacts associated with Development Area A, (2) artificial light impacts on existing residential areas to the northeast and east (along Tranquil Drive, Reverie Drive, Inspiration Way, Glen O Peace and Verdugo Crestline Drive) and (3) scenic vistas of, scenic resources in and the visual character of Development Area A as viewed from the existing residential areas to the northeast and east.

Findings.

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative B.

Rationale for Findings.

Alternative B would not satisfy all of the Proposed Project's objectives because it would result in the development of a substantially denser residential community. Alternative B would increase the density in Development Area A by 33 percent as compared to the density proposed for the Project. Similar to a typical subdivision, the homes proposed under this alternative would be built closer together and have smaller setbacks.

As a result, the proposed lots would have to be designed in a more rigid geometric pattern that would not conform as well to the natural contours of the land. Therefore, in Development Area A, Alternative B would not meet the project objectives of (a) establishing a low-density residential community that avoids the crowded appearance of a typical subdivision and (b) minimizing impacts to important natural landforms and significant natural resources.

In addition, although the homes proposed under this alternative would be mostly shielded from views from Interstate 210, many homes would be visible from the existing homes to the north and northeast of the Site. Therefore, Alternative B would not satisfy the project objective of providing a peaceful, attractive residential development within the context of the surrounding man-made and natural environment, and separating and shielding the development to maximize environmental and land use compatibility with surrounding uses.

Therefore, because the attainment of important project objectives would be significantly reduced under Alternative B, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Proposed Project and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

Alternative C: Duke Property Alternative Access, 280 Lots

Description of the Alternative.

Alternative C provides an alternative access route into Development Area A. Under Alternative C, access to Development Area A would be through the adjacent Duke Property located to the east of the Site. Other than some rearrangement of lots along the access road as it enters Development Area A, the characteristics and impacts of Development Areas A and B under Alternative C would essentially be the same as for the Proposed Project.

Impact Summary of the Alternative.

By realigning the access to Development Area A through the adjacent Duke Property, Alternative C eliminates most of the access road that would parallel Interstate 210 as part of the Proposed Project. As a consequence, most of the grading along the north side of Interstate 210 (including several prominent cut slopes) would be eliminated. Street lighting along this portion of the Site would also be eliminated. However, the revised access through the Duke Property would descend into Development Area A along a topographic ridge identified in the Specific Plan as a Prominent Ridgeline. Alternative C would not reduce any of the significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project to a less-than-significant level. However, Alternative C would substantially

lessen the following significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project: (a) the number of impacted coast live oaks (which would be reduced by 30) and (b) the aesthetic impact of the Project as viewed from Interstate 210.

Findings.

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative C.

Rationale for Findings.

Alternative C satisfies all of the Proposed Project's objectives. However, the project applicant does not currently own or lease any portion of the Duke Property. Prior to and following the completion of the Draft EIR, the project applicant engaged in discussions with the owner of the Duke Property regarding the extension of the primary road in the approved Duke Project to provide access to Development Area A. However, the project applicant was unable to reach agreement with the owner of the Duke Property on terms pursuant to which Alternative C could be implemented. Therefore, the City finds that Alternative C is infeasible and less desirable than the Project and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

Alternative D: Reduced Density, 87 Lots

Description of the Alternative.

Under Alternative D, the entire 887-acre Site would be developed with 87 large single-family homes on "ranchette" lots ranging from 5 to 26.9 acres. Of the 87 homes, 40 would be located in the northern subarea of the Site and 47 would be located in the southern subarea of the Site. Access to the northern subarea of the Site would be provided by Verdugo Crestline Drive, Inspiration Way and Hillhaven Avenue, while access to the southern subarea of the Site would occur at several points along La Tuna Canyon Road. There would be no public dedication of open space and all of the natural open space (approximately 436 acres) would be incorporated into individual lots as private open space, which could be developed by the owners of those lots.

Impact Summary of the Alternative.

Alternative D would substantially lessen the following significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project: (a) construction air quality impacts; (b) construction noise impacts on the existing residential areas to the northeast and east of Development Area

A; and (c) the traffic impact at Study Intersection No. 4 at Development Area A Access/Interstate 210 Westbound Ramps and La Tuna Canyon Road. Alternative D would substantially increase the following significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project: (a) the impact to non-jurisdictional riparian areas, which would be increased from 1.89 acres to 8.66 acres (prior to mitigation); (b) the number of impacted coast live oak trees, which would be increased by 28; (c) the impact of project lighting on Interstate 210 and La Tuna Canyon Road; and (d) the impact on scenic vistas of, scenic resources on and the existing visual character and quality of the Site. In addition, at least two residential street segments between two access points on Verdugo Crestline Drive and Foothill Boulevard could be expected to be significantly impacted by Alternative D, which would not occur with the development of the Proposed Project.

Findings.

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative D.

Rationale for Findings.

As discussed on pages VI-60 through VI-61 in the Draft EIR, Alternative D would not satisfy many of the Proposed Project's objectives identified in the Draft EIR because it would result in the development of substantially fewer homes with fewer recreational facilities and no preservation of open space. For example, Alternative D would not provide a substantial amount of high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future housing needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and help to alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City. In addition, it would not preserve over 75 percent of the Site as open space or provide ample equestrian and other recreational amenities, as well as significant passive open space and landscaping areas. Alternative D also would not minimize impacts to important natural landforms and significant natural resources.

Alternative D would involve the development of 87 new homes, which is a substantially smaller number of homes than would be developed under the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative D would satisfy the following project objectives, although to a significantly lesser extent than the Project: (a) provide regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs of the region; and (b) invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business opportunities associated with the construction, use and occupancy of the Site.

Therefore, because the attainment of important project objectives would be significantly reduced under Alternative D, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Proposed Project and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

Alternative E: Reduced Density, 210 Lots

Description of the Alternative.

Under Alternative E, the density of development within the Development Areas would be reduced by approximately 25 percent. This would result in the construction of 210 single-family homes on the Site, although the homes would be somewhat larger than for the Proposed Project.

Impact Summary of the Alternative.

Alternative E would substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts (prior to mitigation) associated with the traffic on local roadway intersections and segments that would result from the development of the Proposed Project.

Findings.

It is found, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the California Public Resources Code, that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XI (Statement of Overriding Considerations), below, make infeasible Alternative E.

Rationale for Findings.

Alternative E would involve the development of 210 new homes, which is a smaller number of homes than would be developed under the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative E would satisfy the following Proposed Project's objectives, although to a significantly lesser extent than the Project: (a) provide a substantial amount of high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future housing needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and help to alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City; (b) provide greater regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs of the region; and (c) invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business opportunities associated with the construction, use and occupancy of the Site. Alternative E would satisfy the other Proposed Project's objectives.

Therefore, because the attainment of important project objectives would be significantly reduced under Alternative E, the City finds that this

alternative is infeasible and less desireable than the Project and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

Reference.

For a complete discussion of Alternative E, see Section VI.E of the Draft EIR and Section III (Corrections and Additions), page III-115, in the Final EIR.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines provides that an analysis of alternatives to a project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. In addition, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that: "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." An environmentally superior alternative is an alternative to the project that would reduce and/or eliminate the unmitigated, significant adverse environmental impacts associated with a project without creating other significant impacts and without substantially reducing and/or eliminating the environmental benefits attributable to the Project.

The selection of the environmentally superior alternative was based, first, on an evaluation of the extent to which the alternatives reduce or eliminate the significant impacts associated with the Proposed Project and, second, on an across-the-board comparison of the remaining environmental impacts of each alternative.

An absolute determination of the environmentally superior alternative for a project like the Proposed Project is difficult for two reasons. First, due to the scope of the Proposed Project, alternative projects invariably lead to greater impacts with respect to some environmental categories and less impact with respect to others. The identification of which category should prevail in an overall analysis is subject to differing subjective values. Second, it is difficult to develop a total picture because some categories are relatively more or less important and cannot be simply summed.

Nonetheless, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Alternative A (No Project Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative because none of the significant impacts that would occur with the development of the Proposed Project would occur under this alternative. However, as discussed above, when the No Project Alternative is selected as the environmentally superior alternative, another alternative needs to be selected as environmentally superior. Therefore, based on the alternatives analysis in the Final EIR, Alternative B (Development Area A Only, 280 Lots) would be considered the environmentally superior

alternative. Alternative B would eliminate more significant environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project than any other alternative (except for the No Project Alternative). Most important, Alternative B would eliminate all impacts on the southern subarea of the Site, while all of the other alternatives (except for the No Project Alternative) would include development there. In addition, Alternative B would require less landform alteration and less disturbance to native habitat than the Proposed Project on the northern subarea of the Site. Overall, Alternative B would preserve more open space than the Proposed Project and the other alternatives (except for the No Project Alternative), and it would reduce visual impacts from La Tuna Canyon Road. Impacts to public services and utilities under Alternative B would be comparable to the Proposed Project, although Alternative B would have somewhat greater impacts on public services and utilities than Alternatives D and E. However, as previously discussed, Alternative B would not satisfy all of the project objectives.

FINDINGS REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The Approved Project could foster economic growth by increasing the number of residents at the Site who could patronize local businesses and services in the area. In addition, short-term employment opportunities would be provided during the construction phases of the Project. The Approved Project would result in an increase of 175 single-family homes and 534 people at the Site. This growth would be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts.

The roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) associated with the Approved Project would not induce growth because they would only serve project residents.

Significant Irreversible Impacts

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the "uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely." Section 15126.2(c) further

states that "irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified."

The types and level of development associated with the Approved Project would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during construction of the Approved Project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the Approved Project would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Site.

Construction of the Approved Project would require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics) and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development would limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of the Approved Project. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the Los Angeles region.

OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

The City, acting through the Planning Department, is the "Lead Agency" for the Project evaluated in the Final EIR. The City finds that the Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

The City finds that the Final EIR provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.

The Planning Department evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Planning Department prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The Planning Department reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The lead agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR evaluated the following environmental potential project and cumulative impacts: Geology and Soils; Air Quality; Hydrology and Water Quality; Biological Resources (Flora and Fauna, Native Trees and Wildlife Movement); Noise; Artificial Light and Glare; Land Use; Population and Housing; Transportation/Traffic; Public Services (Fire Protection, Police Protection, Libraries, Recreation and Parks, and Schools); Energy Conservation (Electricity and Natural Gas); Utilities and Service Systems (Water, Sewer and Solid Waste and Disposal); Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Environmental Site Assessment and Electromagnetic Field Emissions); Aesthetics; and Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views); and Cultural Resources (Historic Resources, Archaeological Resources and Paleontological Resources). In addition, the Draft EIR considered, in separate sections, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes and Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project. The significant environmental impacts of the Project and the alternatives were identified in the text and summary of the Draft EIR.

The mitigation measures which have been identified for the Project were identified in the text and summary of the Final EIR. The final mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP). Each of the mitigation measures identified in the MMP and contained in the Final EIR is incorporated into the Project. The City finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the MMP and contained in the Final EIR.

Textual refinements and errata were compiled and presented to the decision- makers for review and consideration. The Planning Department staff has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of each textual

change in the various documents associated with the Project review. These textual refinements arose for a variety of reasons. First, it is inevitable that draft documents will contain errors and will require clarifications and corrections. Second, textual clarifications were necessitated in order to describe refinements suggested as part of the public participation process.

The responses to the comments on the Draft EIR, which are contained in the Final EIR, clarify and amplify the analysis in the Draft EIR.

Having reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and in the administrative record as well as the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, the City finds that there is no new significant information in the Final EIR not in the Draft EIR and finds that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

CEQA requires the lead agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the Final EIR as certified by the City and included in MMP as adopted by the City serves that function. The MMP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. In accordance with CEQA, the MMP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, the City hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth in the MMRP as conditions of approval for the Project.

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based is the Department of City Planning, 200 North Spring Street, Room 750, Los Angeles, California 90012.

The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Final EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

The City is certifying a Final EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the Project. It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other State and local agencies (who might be referred to as "responsible agencies" under CEQA). Because the City is the lead agency for the Project, the Final EIR is intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other State and local agencies to carry out the Project.

The Final EIR is a project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the Project. A project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The Final EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the Project by the City of Los Angeles and the other regulatory jurisdictions.

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR has identified unavoidable significant impacts that will result from implementation of the Project. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that, when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in the Final EIR that are not substantially lessened or avoided, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. Article I of the City's CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines contained in Title 15, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq. and thereby requires, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the decisionmaker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects identified in the Final EIR cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. These findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the Final EIR, the source references in the Final EIR, and other documents and material that constitute the record of proceedings.

Based on the analysis in the Final EIR, the Project would result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts with respect to NO_X and PM_{10} emissions during construction, construction noise, artificial light as viewed from La Tuna Canyon Road, Interstate 210 and the existing residential areas north and northeast of the project site, scenic vistas, scenic resources and visual character, and short-term effects on coast live oak trees, and it is not feasible to mitigate such impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the Project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the Project discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Approved Project against the Approved Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the City hereby finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

The reasons stated below summarize the benefits, goals and objectives of the Approved Project, and provide the rationale for the benefits of the Approved Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts of the Approved Project and justify the approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the Approved Project and the certification of the completed Final EIR.

1. Implementation of the Approved Project will provide high-quality housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley. The Approved Project will include 175 new single-family homes.

2. Implementation of the Approved Project will provide regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs for the region and help alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City.

3. Implementation of the Approved Project will include an equestrian trail system.

4. Implementation of the Approved Project will establish a low-density residential community that avoids the crowded appearance of a typical subdivision.

5. Implementation of the Approved Project will provide a peaceful, attractive residential development within the context of the surrounding man-made and natural environment, and separate and shield the development to maximize environmental and land use compatability with surrounding uses.

6. Implementation of the Approved Project will invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business

opportunities associated with the construction, use and occupancy of the project site.

7. Implementation of the Approved Project will accommodate expected population and employment growth within the City and the Sunland-Tujunga Community Plan area and provide adequate supporting transportation and utility infrastructure and public services.

8. Implementation of the Approved Project will include the planting of new coast live oak trees at a minimum replacement ratio of 7.6:1 for impacted coast live oaks. The existing oak trees that will be impacted are in relatively poor health and little coast live oak regeneration has occurred in the Development Areas. In addition, many of the impacted oak trees are not currently visible or accessible due to difficult terrain and dense vegetation. Over the long-term, the new oak tree plantings would ensure the survival of an oak tree population within the Development Areas that is viewable and accessible.

9. Implementation of the Approved Project will reduce peak burned stormwater flow from the Site by at least 10 percent of the existing peak burned flow during a 50-year storm and eliminate approximately 58,600 cubic yards of debris in connection with a 50-year storm.

10. Implementation of the Approved Project will substantially decrease the fire risk with respect to the existing residential areas near the Development Areas. The Development Areas will be protected by a 200-foot fuel modification zone that will reduce the risk of a fire spreading from the Site to existing residential areas. Pavement of a portion of the Development Areas will also eliminate potential fuel. In addition, the proposed water tank(s) can be used in the event of a fire in the existing residential neighborhoods. Finally, the proposed secondary emergency access road for Development Area A that will begin at Inspiration Way will not only provide emergency access for the Project, but will also provide a direct evacuation route to the south for the existing residential areas in proximity to Development Area A.

11. Implementation of the Approved Project will locate the residential development in proximity to existing infrastructure and services where possible.