Vestiging Tentative Tract No. 67505 Project

Environmental Case No.: ENV-2005-2301-EIR
State Clearinghouse No.: 2005111054

Project Location: 22255 and 22241 West Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, California 91364
Community Plan Area: Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills
Council District: 3 – Blumenfield

Project Description: The Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505 Project (Proposed Project) is the subdivision of a 6.2-acre property (two parcels) into 19 lots and the subsequent development of 19 detached, two-story single-family residences. Each residence would have three or four bedrooms and would have a maximum height of two stories, or 33 feet, as established by the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Inner Corridor regulations. Each unit would include a two-car garage. The Project would construct a new private street from San Feliciano Drive to access 12 of the homes, and one new entrance drive off of Mulholland Drive to access four homes; the three remaining homes would have direct driveway access to San Feliciano Drive.
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INTRODUCTION

This Erratum addresses clarifications and minor refinements to the Project analyzed in Environmental Impact Report (EIR), comprised of the Draft EIR dated March 2016, the Final EIR, August 2018, and Erratum to the EIR No. 1 (Erratum No. 1), dated September, 2020, for the Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 67505 Project (Project). These refinements include only minor modifications to the number, size, and location of the proposed on-site retaining walls.

These clarifications and refinements do not change the conclusions of the EIR regarding the Project’s potential impacts, including with respect to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, and hydrology. These modifications merely clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City of Los Angeles (City) decision makers and the public. CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR, or any new significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed refinements to the Project, neither of which has been triggered by the proposed project modifications, after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 specifically states:

New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. ‘Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing the following:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.

- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant refinements in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”
2 TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

This Erratum incorporates and analyzes clarifications and minor refinements to the Project implemented to address comments on the Project raised during the administrative appeal process, as depicted in Appendix A, Modified Retaining Wall Plan, October 6, 2020, and Appendix B, Modified Vesting Tentative Tract Map, October 6, 2020, and are summarized here:

- The relocation of the cul-de-sac bulb at the end of “A” Street (the single private street proposed for the Project) approximately 10 feet in a northerly direction, and the elimination of Retaining Wall No. 7 as depicted in the previous September 24, 2020 Modified Retaining Wall Plan (Retaining Wall Plan);

- The revision and relocation of Retaining Wall No. 5 as depicted in the previous Retaining Wall Plan, moving the wall from the edge of Lot 13 along “A” Street to a location within Lot 13, reducing the height of the wall from 8 feet to a maximum height of 3 feet from existing grade, reducing the length of the wall from 80 feet to 30 feet, and extending a graded slope from the back of the sidewalk along “A” Street to the new location of the wall;

- The correction of the misidentification of a portion of a drainage swale on the rear south end of Lot 12, which was previously incorrectly identified as a second retaining wall portion of Retaining Wall No. 4 in the previous Retaining Wall Plan. The wall is now correctly identified as a drainage swale in the current Modified Retaining Wall Plan;

- The revision of the Vesting Tentative Tract Map to reflect the above refinements and clarifications in a revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map dated October 6, 2020 (Modified VTTM), including minor revisions to the lot areas of Lots 5, 13,17,18 and 19 from the previous Vesting Tentative Tract Map included in the Erratum No. 1, dated September 14, 2020.

Relocation of Cul-De-Sac Bulb at “A” Street and Elimination of Retaining Wall No. 7:

The cul-de-sac located at the end of “A” street was moved approximately 10 feet to the north and proposed Retaining Wall No. 7 as depicted in the previous Retaining Wall Plan, was eliminated. A fill slope will be constructed in lieu of Retaining Wall No. 7. The slight 10-foot relocation of private Street “A” and the removal of Retaining Wall No. 7 does not alter the EIR’s conclusions regarding the Project’s potential aesthetic impacts associated with views of retaining walls. Notably, this retaining wall would not have been visible from outside the Project Site in the first place as it would have been entirely below the grade of the adjacent public right of ways and would not have been visible from Mullholland Drive. In addition, construction of a fill slope in lieu of a retaining wall does not change the impact analysis for aesthetic or biological impacts related to trees. Tree Nos. 203, 204, 208, and 259, nearest the cul-de-sac bulb, will remain in place, within 25 feet of construction related activities, and will continue to be indirectly impacted. Tree No. 257 will continue to require removal and will remain as a relocation candidate, and Tree No. 258 will continue to require removal for the installation of the road. The elimination of this retaining wall and the movement of the cul-de-sac would also not result in an increase in grading within the driplines of Tree Nos. 203, 204, 208, and 259, would not increase grading overall, would not alter the direction of flow and amount of storm water runoff, and would not alter the overall drainage patterns on the site. As a result, this revision would not result in a change to the amounts of rainwater available for these trees or alter the Project site’s hydrology in a manner that would alter the impact conclusions of the EIR and Erratum No. 1. In addition, Impacts to aesthetics, biological
resources, geology and soils, and hydrology would remain less than significant and no further analysis of the issue is required.

**Relocation and Decreased Size of Retaining Wall No. 5 on the Southeast Side of Lot 13:**

Retaining Wall No. 5 has been revised to move it away from its prior location at the western end of Lot 13 along private Street “A” to a location within Lot 13, reducing the height of the proposed wall from a maximum height of approximately 8 feet to a maximum height of 3 feet from existing grade, reducing the length of the wall from 80 feet to 30 feet, and extending a graded slope from the back of the sidewalk along “A” Street to the new location of the wall.

The reduction in size and movement of Retaining Wall No. 5 would not alter potential aesthetic impacts associated with views of retaining walls, as the height and length of the proposed retaining wall would be reduced and it would be relocated from its location along private Street “A” to the interior of the lot, where it would continue to not be visible from the public right of way (the location of the wall would continue to be below the grade of the adjacent private Street “A” and San Feliciano Drive).

With respect to aesthetic and biological resource impacts to trees, the relocation of Retaining Wall No. 5 would be to a location within the dripline of Tree No. 72, which will result in trenching and grading impacts to approximately 5%-10% of the tree’s critical root zone. Tree No. 72 was previously assessed in the EIR to have indirect impacts from construction related activities. The proposed changes to the Project site plans would also change the tree’s assessment from an indirect impact to one having a direct impact. It is not anticipated that the relocation of the retaining wall would require removal of the tree, and the health of the tree would be maintained through the implementation of mitigation measures. Specifically, Mitigation Measure B-13, which requires the hand digging of all trenching under a trees dripline, and Mitigation Measure B-18, which provides guidance to ensure the health of trees that have been substantially root pruned (30% or more the root zone), would ensure that Tree No. 72 would not be required to be removed and could be maintained in good health through construction and operation of the Project. Other mitigation measures to further protect the tree include B-12, that would ensure protection of the canopy and trunk of the tree, and B-17 maintaining healthy soil conditions during construction. No other trees would be affected by this proposed revision to Retaining Wall No. 5.

Relocating Retaining Wall No. 5 would require about 110 cubic yards of overexcavation/recompaction and about 60 additional cubic yards of fill. A similar quantity of cut would be required to move the cul-de-sac at the end of “A” street approximately 10 feet to the north, as well as removing the end walls at Retaining Wall No. 4. As a result, relocating Wall No. 5 would result in no net additional grading-related impacts in a manner that would alter the impact conclusions of the EIR and Erratum.

Similarly, relocating Retaining Wall No. 5 would not alter the direction of flow and amount of storm water runoff, and would not otherwise alter drainage patterns on the site. Similar to the original retaining wall drainage design, stormwater runoff would flow to the base of the slope and then be directed to the open space in the western portion of Lot 13. As a result, this revision would not result in a change to the amounts of rainwater available for onsite trees other than tree no. 72, addressed above, or alter the Project site’s hydrology in a manner that would alter the impact conclusions of the EIR and Erratum. With respect to tree no. 72, the retaining wall only affects a small area within the tree’s dripline, and will not significantly alter the amounts of water available to the tree, allowing the tree to be maintained in place with the implementation of mitigation as described above. Impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, and hydrology
would remain less than significant and no further analysis of the issue is required.

**Revised Detail of Drainage Swale Behind Lot 12:**

The Modified VTTM and Modified Retaining Wall Plan, dated October 6, 2020 correct an incorrect depiction of a wall on the southern end of lot 12 adjacent to Retaining Wall No. 4 in prior tract maps and the Retaining Wall Plan, dated July 21, 2020 and updated October 6, 2020. In the prior plans, this wall was misidentified as a retaining wall, when it is in fact the edge of a drainage swale. This wall is now correctly identified in the Revised VTTM. As this revision does not physically change the Project but rather corrects an erroneous designation in the plans, the revision does not alter the impact analysis for any topic, including aesthetics, biology, geology/grading, and hydrology/drainage.

**Figure 1- Summary of Revised Retaining Wall Modifications (shown in blue)**

**Lot Area Revisions**

As a result of these modifications, the lot area for Lots 5, 13, 17, 18, and 19 has been slightly modified. The below table identifies these changes. As this revision does not physically change the Project but rather makes minor modifications to property boundaries in the plans, the revision does not alter the impact analysis for any topic, including aesthetics, biology, geology and soils, and hydrology.
### Table 1 - Revised Lot Area for Lots 5, 13, 17, 18, and 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Lot Area from Erratum No. 1 Exhibit, dated July 21, 2020 (Square feet)</th>
<th>Revised Tract Map, dated October 6, 2020 Lot Area (Square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23,647</td>
<td>22,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,892</td>
<td>11,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>8,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>8,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11,524</td>
<td>12,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented herein, the changes to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the information included in this Erratum does not disclose any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible alternative or mitigation measure that the Applicant has declined to adopt. All of the information added in this Erratum merely makes insignificant modifications and clarifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic determinations or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.
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October 9, 2020

Mr. Bill Myers
HARRIDGE
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1130
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Subject: VTTM No. 67505 Revisions
Psomas Job No. 1HAR262501

Dear Bill,

This letter is to describe the revisions for this tract map. These revisions were performed to address comments from the most recent public hearing by the Planning Commission. The following comments were made:

- Relocated the cul-de-sac bulb at the end of “A” Street toward the north approximately 10-feet. This allowed the elimination of the retaining wall on lots 5 and 19.
- Revised and relocated the retaining wall on the southeast side of lot 13, along “A” Street. The revision reduced the wall height to a maximum of 3-feet by extending a graded slope from the back of sidewalk along “A” Street. This revision eliminated questions concerning front yard wall height and two walls on one lot.
- Revised the graphic detailing for the wall behind lot 12 along a proposed drainage swale. This revision was a drafting edit since the edge of the swale was not intended to be a retaining wall. This revision eliminated misunderstanding of having two walls on one lot.
- Revised Typical Grading Section “A” – “A” to show proposed retaining wall. This was a minor adjustment for clarity.
- Revised lot lines, lot areas, curve data and minor graphics for the above revisions.

These revisions did not change grading quantities, drainage patterns or analysis. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

PSOMAS

Michael J. Crehan, PE
Vice President
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