

Comment 7.03

Use of sound wall not a 5 ½ foot wall to block some of the noise which otherwise would intrude on the home residents. Supplement that with a bountiful use of trees and high bushy foliage.

Response 7.03

See Response to Comment No. 6.03. No sound wall is proposed along the north side of Rinaldi Street adjacent to the school and any sound wall that may be planned on the south side of Rinaldi Street is beyond the scope of the proposed project as this off-site property is not under the ownership or control of the school. Discussion of how any potential off-site sound wall should be landscaped is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

Comment 7.04

Schedule athletics and performing arts to completion prior to 5 or 6 p.m. to protect the residents from intrusive noise.

Response 7.04

See Response to Comment No. 6.07 concerning expected hours of operation for special events. While many athletics and performing arts events do conclude prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM., due to the nature of such events, the scheduling requirements of a secondary school campus and the ability for friends and family to attend events after work, it is not feasible to schedule all athletic and performing arts events such that they would be completed prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM. Additionally, a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure IV.H-8) is included in the Draft EIR requiring that potential noise problems be addressed as they arise. In doing so, incremental increases in noise levels would be maintained at less than five decibels, which is below the level of significance. This measure would ensure that exterior noise generated during special events would be minimized at nearby residences. The comment's request that special events not be held after 6:00 PM is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

LETTER NO. 8

June 3, 2005

Ed and Christine Kozdrowicki
Chatsworth, CA

Comment 8.01

We are very concerned about the Sierra Canyon School project impact on our Neighborhood. Foremost the noise and pollution levels will be intolerable. A school with sports activities, Art performances, swimming meets will create a lot of noise and chaos.

Response 8.01

The project's potential impacts to noise and air pollution are discussed in Section IV.H, Noise and IV.B, Air Quality of the Draft EIR, respectively. Regarding noise, as concluded on pages

IV.H-19-20 of the Draft EIR, operation of the school, including sports activities and special events, would not result in significant project noise impacts in the surrounding neighborhood, but a significant cumulative noise impact would occur at the residences south of Rinaldi Street (Receptor No. 3, as identified in Figure IV.H-1 of the Draft EIR). However, this cumulative impact would occur with or without the project, as the project itself would only contribute to approximately one decibel of the cumulative noise levels, which would not be, by itself, perceptible to the general public. Furthermore, pursuant to Mitigation Measure IV.H-8, surrounding residents shall be provided with a telephone number to register any noise complaints during special events. Based on complaints, the offending activity shall cease or the hours of such activity shall be adjusted, as needed. Thus, surrounding residents will have a means of bringing noise issues to the attention of the school so that they can then be dealt with in a timely manner.

Regarding air pollution, the Draft EIR concluded in Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-20 that regional and localized air quality impacts of the project would be less than significant. An assessment of air pollutant concentrations attributable to the project was performed at four neighboring residential locations to the west, south and east of the project site. That analysis found that CO concentrations at the four locations would all be well below State 1- and 8-Hour Standards.

Comment 8.02

The vehicles will park all over our neighborhood and will create unsafe conditions for all of us and our children.

Response 8.02

The amount of parking proposed for the project (i.e., 236 spaces) would meet the daily needs of the school and is expected to meet the parking needs for most campus events, including athletic and performing arts events. Parking needs for annual events (e.g., graduation, open houses, “back to school” day/night) would be considered during the planning of such events, with adjustments made, as necessary (e.g., events can be separated by class level). However, in the event of any overflow parking, the school would provide shuttle service from local parks upon permit, or other off-site locations. Possible locations include churches in the area that have accommodated parking for the existing elementary school. Parking would be subject to any conflicts and church approval at the time, if necessary. Church sites typically have 75 to 250 spaces from which buses could shuttle back and forth to the Campus and generally are able to rent their parking spaces for such uses on a case-by-case basis (refer to Attachment A of Section III, Responses to Written Comments of this Final EIR, which includes a letter from a local church indicating their willingness to allow the applicant to rent parking spaces, if and when needed for special events at the Sierra Canyon Secondary School campus). Thus, while some parking would be available on Rinaldi Street adjacent to the project site, it is not expected that school-related parking would occur on neighborhood streets, as ample parking would be provided by the school. However, in response to this comment, and other comments concerning parking, additional mitigation has been added to this Final EIR that would require the school to prohibit any parking on residential streets and that would provide an on-site Parking Management Program (refer to Correction and Addition Nos. IV.J-11 through 13). Students and parents will be required to sign a statement at the start of each school year acknowledging that the use of residential streets for parking or loading/unloading is prohibited by the school and that the school will monitor and strictly enforce such parking and loading/unloading prohibitions.

Comment 8.03

We do not need a school to destroy the character of the area, especially since we have some very fine schools down the road.

Response 8.03

While the perceived character of any particular project can be very subjective, the concern expressed by the comment is noted. The Draft EIR did assess the character of the project relative to land use and aesthetic issues and associated significance thresholds established by the City of Los Angeles for Draft EIRs. Specifically, as discussed on in Section IV.G, Land Use (page IV.G-21) of the Draft EIR, the Rinaldi Street extension would provide buffering between the proposed campus and the existing residential neighborhoods, creating an interface between the physical and operational characteristics of the project that would be substantially compatible with the surrounding area. In addition, private schools are permitted in the RE zone by CUP pursuant to the City of Los Angeles, which indicates that such uses are anticipated and appropriate in residential areas.

Relative to aesthetics, the Draft EIR found that “[b]ecause of the location and condition of the school site (between the extension of Rinaldi Street and the Ronald Reagan Freeway), it [the site] would not be considered as contributing to the valued visual character of the neighborhood, community, or localized area” (page IV.A-16 of the Draft EIR). Furthermore, as stated on page IV.A-17, “The campus would provide, through an articulate and uniform design, a landmark feature (e.g., the school as a whole would convey a sense of a distinct identity and visual character) that would enhance the visual quality of the property and surrounding area.” Aesthetic elements of the project, including the incorporation of building massing that would complement the site’s landform and sloping topography, the use of natural materials and textures, and landscaping, would ensure that a high quality visual environment would be created. While the Draft EIR found that the visual contrast of the project to existing features of the area would be considered a significant impact, such contrast in and of itself, would not “destroy” the character of the area.

Ultimately, the decisionmakers must evaluate the project and make findings that it is, or will be, compatible with existing and future development on neighboring properties, as part of the CUP approval process. The comment’s concerns about neighborhood character are noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

Comment 8.04

Please consider moving the project to another site.

Response 8.04

Several alternative sites were considered for the proposed project. These sites are discussed in Section VI, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, (pages VI-27 through 35) of the Draft EIR. As discussed on Page VI-27, several sites were identified and eventually rejected because of their size or location relative to surrounding uses and/or the existing Sierra Canyon Elementary and Middle school. Additionally, negotiations for purchase on some of the identified sites could not be completed to the satisfaction of the seller or the applicant. The alternative site that was ultimately analyzed as Alternative 4 was concluded to have generally comparable impacts as

compared to the proposed project. It was also determined that this alternative would not fully meet the objectives of the project.

LETTER NO. 9

June 13, 2005

C.T. Lin
10958 Oklahoma Avenue
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Comment 9.01

This is a request for the approval on raising the height of the existing brick wall on the north side of my residence property located at 10958 Oklahoma Ave., Chatsworth, CA 91311 and for asking Sierra Canyon School to pay to build the raised brick wall along the said property line.

After having consulting with Sanje Ratnavale, Chief Operating Officer, of Sierra Canyon School, about the noise that may be generated by the traffic and the school and potential intrusion or vandalism, he asked me to submit this request to raise the height of the existing brick wall that runs along the south side of Rinaldi Street, immediately adjacent to the current construction site of the paved street and the future Sierra Canyon Secondary School. Mr. Ratnavale, on behalf of the Sierra Canyon School, has agreed to pay for the expenses incurred in raising an addition 4-5 feet of brick wall above the existing wall once the City of Los Angeles has approved the request.

The wall runs about 160 feet along the property line of my residence by the south side of Rinaldi Street, immediately next to a street access opening that is currently present in the existing wall, connecting between Oklahoma Avenue and Rinaldi Street. It has been decided by the City and the School that this existing opening will be blocked and sealed with brickwork to avoid the residential area nearby the opening to become an access for dropping-off and picking-up students in the future.

Please give this request a favorable consideration and reply to me through a regular mail sent to my home address at the location above, or through fax at 818-772-5327 (please call first). Thank you very much.

Response 9.01

During circulation of the Draft EIR, the applicant held community meetings with neighbors and made a presentation to the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council in order to share project information, involve neighbors in the process, and keep them informed of the project's status. As a follow-up to these outreach efforts, the author of the comment and a representative of the school discussed the school's willingness to increase the height of the existing wall on the south side of Rinaldi Street and close the current opening allowing pedestrian access from the terminus of Oklahoma Avenue to Rinaldi Street. However, how these improvements would be implemented has not been determined, given that the existing wall and opening are not under the control of the applicant. Should individuals pursue construction of the wall extension, the school would undertake the construction pursuant to City approval (assuming that the wall and opening are within the public right-of-way) and would fund the cost of that construction. However, as construction of the wall extension is not included as part of the project and is not a