

COMMENT LETTER No. 109

Suzanne Sunenshine
12652 Neon Way
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 27, 2001

RE: Draft EIR #99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 109.1

I am writing to urge you to **deny the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School** in Granada Hills. I have lived in this neighborhood for 28 years and have seen the traffic problems steadily worsen. I am not opposed to development, but I believe residential development is better suited to our community. I do not want to see a large school complex and the associated traffic and safety hazards on the corner of Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue because of traffic and safety concerns.

I travel down Nugent Drive to Rinaldi Street daily. Presently there is increased traffic from Hillcrest school, but it has minimal impact on traffic turning right onto Rinaldi. If the school builds on the western side of Shoshone, the increased traffic will make travel onto Rinaldi a nightmare, especially given the additional pedestrian traffic that will be crossing the street. This is an unacceptable safety risk to pedestrians and drivers alike. Additionally, the traffic will become grid locked.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 109.1

Traffic impacts and associated safety issues are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts and impacts upon pedestrian safety would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 109.2

This area is zoned for residential use and I firmly support that it remains that way. I understand that Hillcrest Christian School is a private business. Please do not allow them to expand into open space that has been designated for residential development.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 109.2

The existing land use and zoning designations are discussed in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. The project is located in the A1-1-K zoning district and the Very Low I Residential land use designation of the Granada Hills/Knollwood Community Plan. As provided by Section 12.24 U of the Planning and Zoning Code, private schools, elementary and high (kindergarten through 12th grade), are permitted conditional uses within the Agricultural (A1) zone under the authority of the City Planning

Commission with Appeals to the City Council. It should be noted that the proposed project is consistent with the underlying zoning for the property, as schools are conditionally permitted uses in the A1-1 Zone. Furthermore, although the residentially developed property includes a substantial amount of vacant land, the project site is not zoned or designated as open space or for public recreational uses.

COMMENT 109.3

It's clear this project can have only a detrimental impact on our community.

I strongly urge you to deny a conditional use permit, parking variance, zoning administration adjustment and oak free permit for the Hillcrest Christian School proposed expansion.

Please place this letter of objection concerning the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion into the official records of the County of Los Angeles; forward copies to all applicable city and county departments; and keep me informed of any and all variations and notices regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 109.3

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 110

Kim Tardif
13532 Gladstone Ave.
Sylmar, CA 91342
August 2, 2001

Ref. Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 110.1

My name is Kim Tardif and I am a parent and have two children attending at Hillcrest Christian School, and want to take this time to communicate to you my support of the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

This school has been such a blessing to our family because of the care in which are kids are taught and taken care by the staff at Hillcrest. We don't live close to the school we commute every day during the

school year to take my children there And have been for 10 years starting with my oldest son who is in the 9th grade, he started at Hillcrest in Kindergarten, that's ho* much we love the school and know first hand its need for an extended campus. With the way in which communities grow I believe that Hillcrest can assit (sic) in meeting the educational needs for new families in this area.

With the draft EIR completed I truly believe this project should move forward to fill a desperate need and obligation we have to reach new families and also ones who have already live in this area and continue for ones like us who commute that would welcome a n extended campus for the high schoolers.

I know Hillcrest has been a good neighbor to its neighbors and the community over the years and has worked with them on any problems that have arised and any that will in the fixture. Also the traffic mitigation recommended will improve the traffic flow at the existing school during peak rush hour limes. Again I truly believe this project should be moved forward we need more moral and educated young adults in this north end of the San Fernando Valley and with this new campus it will be done.

For your consideration Thank You in advance,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 110.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 111

Debbie Tate
16925 Knollwood Drive
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 30, 2001

Re: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 111.1

As a parent with a child attending Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to express my support for the proposed additional building and expansion of this school at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

The school's administration has completed an extensive Environmental Impact Report for this project, and hearings are to begin soon seeking the city's approval. I believe they have shown that the expanded

facilities will not harm the area or neighborhood, and know that they have given special attention to address traffic and noise issues. Some neighbors are concerned about the increased traffic flow. However Rinaldi Street is a busy thoroughfare and I feel that this location is better than putting a new school into a small neighborhood setting where the increased traffic would not be supported by existing smaller streets and traffic patterns.

The population of the North Valley continues to grow, with new housing developments in Granada Hills and the Porter Ranch area of Northridge. No new public schools are being built to support the additional children moving into the area, so I believe that Hillcrest Christian School will help provide additional education alternatives for our children. This school not only provides a quality education for our children, but is teaching them to be responsible, productive members of society and assisting them to grow up with good values that are a positive influence on the entire community.

I ask that you would please consider supporting the approval of this proposed building project. Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 111.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 112

Marla Terrell
21355 Candice Place
Chatsworth, CA 91311
July 25, 2001

REFERENCE: CASE #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 112.1

As a parent of a Hillcrest Christian School student, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 Cu at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

With the draft EIR completed, we believe the said project must move forward to fill a need for quality education in the North end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest Christian School as established itself

as a good neighbor, working with the community to solve problems as they may arise. Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

The population of this area of our community continues to grow and our desire is that Hillcrest Christian School will assist in meeting this important need. This school is a great asset to the area because of the fine students that attend.

Thank you for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 112.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 113

Ron and Allison Thompson
10808 Key West Avenue
Northridge, CA 91326
July 25, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 113.1

I am a concerned parent from Hillcrest Christian School I would like to strongly express my support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

With the draft EIR completed, my husband and I strongly believe the above referenced project MUST move forward to fill a need for quality education in the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has a long-standing relationship with our community, working to solve problems as they might arise. Additionally, the recommended plan provides to tremendously improve traffic on an already VERY busy Rinaldi street.

As our community continues to grow leaps and bounds, it is our desire that Hillcrest Christian School will assist in meeting the growing need of a quality Christian education. This school is an incredible asset to our community not only because of the wonderful students that attend, but the well-rounded young adults who graduate from it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 113.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 114

James and Susan Tipton
11955 Nugent Dr.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 27, 2001

RE: Draft EIR #99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 114.1

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We are 25-year residents of the community. For the past 16 years, we have resided at our home, two blocks north of the corner of Rinaldi and Shoshone.

Our main objection to this proposed expansion regards the already intolerable traffic and traffic safety situation. Cars travel far too fast down Nugent Drive, which is the ONLY western egress for a very large area to the north (all the way up to Sesnon Blvd). Residents who commute to the west valley and Simi Valley travel down Nugent then turn west onto Rinaldi. On school days we are bombarded with cars traveling from the Porter ranch area up Nugent to drop off and pick up students at Frost Middle School (Bradford and Nugent). The portion of Shoshone south of our house is congested with the drop-off, pick-up, and activities from St. Euphrasia Church/School, as well as the Hillcrest Christian School. Already we wait several minutes, and sometimes several traffic signals in order to turn left onto Rinaldi from Shoshone. This is will be severely impacted by the addition of pedestrian traffic traveling between the existing campus and the proposed new site.

Commuters from Santa Clarita, Lancaster and Palmdale drive down Balboa and travel west over Rinaldi. Likewise, they commute home via Rinaldi/Balboa (evidence the long, double left turn lane at that intersection). This has been an existing problem that has steadily worsened over the past five years! Let's NOT compound it further.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.1

Traffic impacts and associated safety issues are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts and impacts upon pedestrian safety would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 114.2

The lack of adequate parking would further ensure chaos as drivers, many of whom will be less experienced teenage drivers, scour the neighborhood for parking spaces. This creates not only an inconvenience to the residents of the community, but also a safety hazard to drivers and pedestrians.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.2

Parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. The Draft EIR further concluded a significant and unavoidable parking impact may occur as a result of school-related special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year. Additionally, as stated in the Draft EIR (see page 232), project mitigation measures will require staff administrators to appoint and provide staff personnel to operate a pedestrian crossing guard program at the intersection of Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue. With implementation of this mitigation measure, project impacts on pedestrian safety would be less than significant.

COMMENT 114.3

This area is zoned for residential use and I firmly support that it remains that way. Please do not degrade our neighborhood with this private business endeavor. There are more appropriate sites that are better suited to the building of such a project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.3

The existing land use and zoning designations are discussed in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. The project is located in the A1-1-K zoning district and the Very Low I Residential land use designation of the Granada Hills/Knollwood Community Plan. As provided by Section 12.24 U of the Planning and Zoning Code, private schools, elementary and high (kindergarten through 12th grade), are

permitted conditional uses within the Agricultural (A1) zone under the authority of the City Planning Commission with Appeals to the City Council. It should be noted that the proposed project is consistent with the underlying zoning for the property, as schools are conditionally permitted uses in the A1-1 Zone. Furthermore, although the residentially developed property includes a substantial amount of vacant land, the project site is not zoned or designated as open space or for public recreational uses. The applicant has looked at alternative sites and none could be found.

COMMENT 114.4

We know from past experience that this school has continually returned to the planning commission to expand their facility. They have chipped away, one small piece at a time, until they reached maximum capacity on the existing property. While they seem agreeable to scaling back their plans, there is no safeguard against their ultimate expansion. We know they intend to have a full size track/stadium with outdoor lighting and a sound system. Please. This is a further affront to our neighborhood.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.4

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. As stated previously, should the current plans change or should the project applicant submit additional plans for development in the future that are not covered under this project proposal and/or EIR, such plans will be subject to additional environmental review in accordance with CEQA. With regard to the applicants plans for future expansion, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 7 on page 32.

COMMENT 114.5

Just the fact that this proposal has reached this stage is a cause for distress. Certainly any project that requires so many variances does not belong here. There are eleven anticipated significant effects on the environment that can not be adequately mitigated. I'm sure the traffic portion of the environmental impact report does not accurately reflect peak traffic times on our street since the traffic counter was in place on Shoshone on non-school days. I feel certain that any committee member experiencing the situation in person would agree that this neighborhood could not handle increased traffic congestion.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.5

The traffic impacts of the proposed project are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. The traffic impact report includes an analysis of existing traffic conditions, future traffic conditions without the proposed project and future traffic volumes with the proposed project. The comment is incorrect in its statement that traffic counts were taken when school was not in session. As stated on page 206 of the Draft EIR:

“Turning movement traffic counts for the study intersections were conducted during the weeks

of September 11, 18 and 25, 2000, after all local area schools were in session for the fall schedule. Public and private schools in the area were in session during the period the traffic counts were conducted.”

Moreover, additional detail and analysis was provided to specifically account for school-related traffic patterns in the project area. For additional information on this issue, see the discussion of neighborhood traffic patterns beginning on page 203 of the Draft EIR.

Additionally, the commentator is incorrect in stating that the project would result in eleven significant effects on the environment which can not be mitigated. The Draft EIR identified special event parking and the demolition of an historic resource as the only two issue areas that would result in an unavoidable significant impact. With regard to historic resources, this impact can be reduced to a level below significance with the relocation mitigation plan. With regard to the project’s impacts on historic resources, and the relocation plan for the historic structure currently located at 17551 Rinaldi Street, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 3 on page 28.

COMMENT 114.6

Please consider the far-reaching consequences of allowing this expansion. The area to the west of Shoshone is zoned for horses. Some of these properties have been here more than thirty years. With the expansion of this school, Zelzah Avenue will need to be paved to allow egress from the corner of Mayerling and Shoshone. The resulting high traffic will disrupt this quiet neighborhood as well.

It’s clear this project will have only a detrimental impact on our residentially zoned community.

We urge you to deny the Hillcrest Christian School, Inc. a conditional use permit, parking variance, zoning administration adjustment and oak tree permit.

Please place this letter of objection concerning the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion into the official records of the County of Los Angeles; forward copies to all applicable city and county departments; and keep us informed of any and all variations and notices regarding this matter.

Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 114.6

The properties immediately surrounding the West Campus property to the west of Shoshone Avenue are zoned RA-1 and do not have a “K” designation indicating an equine keeping district.

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts

would be reduced to less than significant levels. The required roadway improvements do not include any improvements to Zelzah Avenue. The commenter will be placed on the project mailing list and will be notified of all future public hearings for this project.

COMMENT LETTER No. 115

(Sent in Duplicate)

James Tipton

11955 Nugent Dr.

Granada Hills, CA 91344

August 6, 2001

RE: Draft UR #99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 115.1

I am writing to express **my strong opposition** to the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. I am a 25-year resident of the community and a pediatrician locally.

The proposed project of the Hillcrest Christian School, Inc. is deliberately and deceptively represented on the EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT 115.2

First, the Hillcrest Christian School, Inc. is misrepresenting itself now as the "Hillcrest Christian School and Church" even though their church moved from the site several years ago. Both of their large, lighted signs, which previously said Hillcrest Christian Church, have, for several years, read, "Hillcrest Christian School" Hillcrest Christian School, Inc. is now misrepresenting itself as a church in hopes of more favorable treatment.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.2

Hillcrest Christian School is a California non-profit religious corporation. The ministry has always included a church located at the school site and has conducted church services at the site weekly since 1954. Because church worship services are a part of the original purpose of the ministry, the church

sanctuary has not been altered for class use nor has a request been made to alter the building in any past, present or future conditional use request.

When the school corporation was founded, the school covenanted with the church leadership that the church sanctuary would always remain intact specifically for church usage.

COMMENT 115.3

Secondly, the EIR is based on a proposed total enrollment of 1200 students, but their construction plans delineate a capacity of 1400 students.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.3

The Draft EIR is based on a total future enrollment of 1,200 students because that is the number of students the applicant is seeking in the entitlement applications. Any request to increase the enrollment beyond what is analyzed in the Draft EIR will require additional environmental review in accordance with CEQA. With regard to the applicants plans for potential future expansion, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 7 on page 32.

COMMENT 115.4

Thirdly, in asking for parking variances, they are grossly underestimating the number of parking places which their employees will require, requesting spaces for only 90% of their “full-time teaching equivalents,” ignoring the fact that they plan to have many part-time employees who are there concurrently, as they now have.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.4

Parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concluded the proposed project is expected to provide enough parking on-site to meet the anticipated daily operational parking demand. The variance is based on the parking demand study which demonstrated the proposed parking areas would be suitable to meet the needs of the project. The Draft EIR also concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. As such, a significant and unavoidable parking impact was identified as a result of school-related-special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year.

COMMENT 115.5

Fourthly, the traffic study numbers do not add up, and Hillcrest Christian School, Inc., misrepresents the impact of traffic congestion as “less than significant.” They spread the “peak traffic” out over several hours, ignoring the fact that the peak traffic, in fact, occurs over 20-30 minutes twice each school day. Additionally, because of the severe congestion already, many local residents take circuitous

routes around the area on school days, which causes the numbers to under-represent the true impact. They are also deceptive when they say that the project will “benefit the local neighborhood” by providing greater school capacity, in that their traffic data clearly shows that the vast majority of their students, in fact, come from east of Balboa and from west of Reseda, clearly not from the “local neighborhood.”

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.5

Traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the EIR, all of the project’s traffic impacts can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant with implementation of required mitigation measures. As noted in the project Traffic Study, the project area is characterized by three peak hour traffic periods. The 24-hour automatic traffic count conducted on Shoshone between Flanders and Mayerling was 7,652 vehicles--3,949 vehicles northbound and 3,703 vehicles southbound. The a.m. peak hour occurred between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. with a total of 1,104 vehicles--397 vehicles northbound and 707 vehicles southbound. The p.m. peak hour occurred between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m. with a total of 566 vehicles--359 vehicles northbound and 207 vehicles southbound. A second afternoon peak occurs during the time area schools are letting out between 2:00 and 3:00 p.m. with a total of 640 vehicles--396 vehicles northbound and 244 vehicles southbound and between 3:00 and 4:00 p.m. with a total of 691 vehicles--338 vehicles northbound and 353 vehicles southbound. In accordance with the mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, construction haul trips will be scheduled outside of the a.m. and p.m. peak hour periods.

COMMENT 115.6

Fifthly, in estimating the seating capacity of the athletic field bleachers, they count as one person, space which is nearly twice as wide as a seat at Dodger Stadium, again falsely under-representing the true capacity.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.6

The inclusion of bleacher seating was inadvertently included within the project description of the EIR. The proposed project will not include any bleacher seating. The project applicant has not submitted a request for bleacher seating as part of the current CUP application and it is understood that no bleacher seating will be provided. While the school may hold special events on the proposed athletic field (i.e., graduation ceremonies, fund raisers etc.), temporary seating would likely employ the use of chairs or benches. Nevertheless, for the purposes of assessing impacts from outdoor activity, the Draft EIR conservatively evaluated the noise and traffic impacts resulting from a crowd of 1,000 persons. As such, the Draft EIR adequately covers those respective environmental issues, regardless of whether or not bleacher seating or no seating is provided.

COMMENT 115.7

As a pediatrician, I worry about the safety of the children who cross Shoshone. Parents now traveling southbound on Shoshone frequently stop about 75 feet before the intersection at Rinaldi, to allow their children to illegally cross mid-block into the open Hillcrest Christian School gate. Obviously, the school's educational programs which are already in place and which they say will mitigate against any dangers, are clearly ineffective.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.7

Section IV.J.1, Traffic, of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts associated with increased student activity at the corner of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street. As stated in the Draft EIR, Hillcrest School will incorporate pedestrian safety measures into their standard daily operating procedures. These safety measures are addressed on pages 230 and 231 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 115.8

Clearly, the proposed expansion of Hillcrest Christian School, Inc is a business move. It is **not consistent** with the Granada Hills-Knollwood Community Plan.

As of Monday, July 30th, a representative of Mr. Hal Bernson's office (Phyllis Winger) told us that their office had not received a copy of the EIR. The EIR is a very complicated document. I would like to hear Mr. Bernson's detailed assessment of the EIR and this project. I would like to hear your detailed assessment of this project. I urge you both to **oppose** the proposed expansion of Hillcrest Christian School, Inc.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 115.8

The existing land use and zoning designations are discussed in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. The project is located in the A1-1-K zoning district and the Very Low I Residential land use designation of the Granada Hills/Knollwood Community Plan. As provided by Section 12.24 U of the Planning and Zoning Code, private schools, elementary and high (kindergarten through 12th grade), are permitted conditional uses within the Agricultural (A1) zone under the authority of the City Planning Commission with Appeals to the City Council. Thus, the proposed project is consistent with the underlying zoning district.

COMMENT LETTER No. 116

Susan Tipton
11955 Nugent Dr.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 6, 2001

RE: Draft EIR 99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA
HILLCREST CHRISTIAN SCHOOL & CHURCH WEST CAMPUS EXPANSION

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 116.1

I have spent many hours reading the above referenced EIR. I am appalled at the deficiencies, distortions, and inconsistencies. The following are issues that need re-examination and further clarification or modification.

- It is misleading to call this project “Hillcrest Christian School & Church” because a “Hillcrest Christian Church” does not exist anymore; it merged with Shepherd of the Hills years ago. The church building does remain on the premises and is rented out to a congregation on Sundays. This is detailed in the Draft EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.1

With regard to the Hillcrest Christian School’s association with the Hillcrest Christian Church and the Shepard of the Hills congregation, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 4 on page 30.

COMMENT 116.2

- A major flaw in the Draft EIR is that this entire study is based on a TOTAL ENROLLMENT of 1200 students (East and West campuses) when the TOTAL CAPACITY of the combined facilities will be 1400. Either (a) this study needs to be based on the full enrollment capacity at the time of the completed project, or (b) the proposed project needs to be scaled back to allow a maximum of 400 students on the West campus.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.2

With regard to the capacity of the school site, the current proposal includes a request for a maximum capacity of 1,200 students between both campuses combined. Accordingly, the analysis in the EIR is based on a total maximum school enrollment of 1,200 students. Any changes in this proposal above 1,200 students will require additional environmental review in accordance with CEQA.

COMMENT 116.3

- The evaluation of the needed number of parking spaces is deficient. The report states (p.235) that “The East Campus is currently served by a total of 148 permanent parking spaces, which are established under the authority of the existing conditions of approval.” The *assumption* that the current parking situation on the East Campus is adequate is a distortion, since presently cars are parked daily along Rinaldi Street. This invalidates the conclusions of the study. Since both campuses are in operation at the same time, adequate parking must be provided for the full capacity of the entire Hillcrest Christian School. Please calculate the minimum number of parking spaces needed to meet the City of Los Angeles Parking Code at each campus. The number of parking spaces has been further minimized by the calculation allocating staff parking at 0.9 spaces per staff member – on what is this based? – a 10% absenteeism rate in their employees? One would think they would need at least one space per daily employee, including those who are part-time. And the idea of using the grass field on the East Campus for stacked-parking is ludicrous, this is unreasonable and can not be enforced – drivers will simply search for street parking. Let’s be realistic about this.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.3

Parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. A discussion of the City of Los Angeles code requirements is presented on page 235 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the Draft EIR, the project would be able to provide enough parking on site to meet the anticipated daily operational parking demand. The variance is based on the parking demand study which demonstrated the proposed parking areas would be suitable to meet the needs of the project. The Draft EIR concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. The Draft EIR further concluded a significant and unavoidable parking impact may occur as a result of school-related special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year.

The use of the overflow parking area would require cars to be parked in tandem in order for the area to fit 130 cars. In the past, this area has been used by Hillcrest as a reserve parking area to accommodate overflow parking for special events. The parking calculations are based on an average vehicle fleet of compact and mid sized-cars. During special events Hillcrest staff directs cars into and out of the parking area and the tandem stacked parking approach has been implemented effectively.

COMMENT 116.4

- The estimated capacity of the proposed stadium is both inaccurate and misleading. On page 43, the final paragraph discusses the finished athletic field, which will include bleachers “estimated” to accommodate a maximum of “approximately 1,000 persons”. This is a gross inaccuracy. My calculations are based on the stadium seat cushion, which I took to the Rose

Bowl for UCLA football games (before the new seats were installed). This standard seat cushion measures 14 inches wide and fits perfectly in a single stadium 'seat'. Therefore, the estimated seating capacity of bleachers consisting of 10 rows, 250 feet long, measuring the individual seating area at 14 inches is 2,140 persons, not 1,000. This has a very significant impact on traffic, parking and noise.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.4

The inclusion of bleacher seating was inadvertently included within the project description of the EIR. The proposed project will not include any bleacher seating. The project applicant has not submitted a request for bleacher seating as part of the current CUP application and it is understood that no bleacher seating will be provided. While the school may hold special events on the proposed athletic field (i.e., graduation ceremonies, fund raisers etc.,) temporary seating would likely employ the use of chairs or benches. Nevertheless, for the purposes of assessing impacts from outdoor activity, the Draft EIR conservatively evaluated the noise and traffic impacts resulting from a crowd of 1,000 persons. As such, the Draft EIR adequately covers those respective environmental issues, regardless of whether or not bleacher seating or no seating is provided.

COMMENT 116.5

- The plan states that all traffic into and out of the proposed West Campus parking lot would use the driveway to be located on Rinaldi Street, 250 feet west of Shoshone Avenue. This distance will allow for approximately 13 cars (at approximately 17 feet each). Where will the cars line up after they back up to the Rinaldi Shoshone intersection? Likewise, how many cars will be turning into the property from the east bound lanes on Rinaldi Street? Where will these cars 'line up'? How will this left turn line interfere with the left turn lane at Shoshone Avenue? How can this one intersection reasonably handle this amount of traffic? Additionally, the plan is deficient in exploring alternative solutions to contain this large volume of traffic completely within the boundaries of its property – perhaps a long road which can circle the property so these cars can not congest the public roadway. As the plan stands now, it is unclear how the carpool line will function with two lanes feeding into it from Rinaldi Street (one turning right from westbound lanes; the other turning left from eastbound lanes). Will there be two parallel lines of cars? This is further complicated by students and staff parking in this same lot at the same time. How will this be handled? How many cars, and at what rate, can be processed in this fashion? During what hours will the drop-off and pick-up be? Can this be handled adequately and safely without causing congestion on Rinaldi Street?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.5

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts

would be reduced to less than significant levels. As stated on page 227 of the Draft EIR, access to the proposed parking lot on the West Campus will be provided via one ingress/egress driveway located approximately 250 feet west of Shoshone Avenue on Rinaldi Street. This driveway will permit full access to the West Campus with left and right turn entry and exiting onto and from Rinaldi Street. It is anticipated that the Hillcrest-related traffic that enters the West Campus site will alleviate traffic congestion at the Shoshone/Rinaldi intersection and will not have to make either a u-turn on Rinaldi Street or enter the neighborhood to the north of the school site via Shoshone. It should be noted that LADOT's determination does not include approval of the project's driveways, internal circulation and parking scheme. In order to fully evaluate these terms, a site plan with a minimum scale of 1" = 40' will be required to be submitted to LADOT Valley Development Review, prior to submittal of building plans for plan check by the Department of Building and Safety.

COMMENT 116.6

- THE GRANADA HILLS/KNOLLWOOD COMMUNITY PLAN CONSISTENCY

(Inconsistency?)

- *Objective of the Plan:*

a) Items 4 & 5: These items refer to the project's compatibility with the adjacent and existing properties located on the west side of Shoshone Avenue. While the report points to the compatibility of the proposed building with the existing East Campus building, the proposed building is not at all similar to the existing church structure, which is directly across the street. The proposed large stucco structure on the West Campus will alter the residential character of Rinaldi Street. Rinaldi Street is lined with residential structures, with a low, one or two story, profile. Outside of the gas stations on the corner of Balboa and Rinaldi (a major intersection), the only non-residential structures along Rinaldi between Balboa and Wilbur (about 3 miles?) are Rinaldi Street School. Hillcrest Christian School and Kindergarten. Contrary to the report a three story structure with 20-40 foot retaining walls does not (a) preserve or enhance the distinct residential character of the community, nor (b) preserve well-maintained residential neighborhoods of single and multiple-family housing. Further, the proposed project will not be compatible with the adjacent and existing properties located in the surrounding residential and rural neighborhoods on the west side of Shoshone Avenue and Zelzah Avenue and north to Mayerling Street.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.6

The project site is located in the A1-1 Zone District which allows school uses with a conditional use permit. As indicated in Section III.E, Project Approvals Required (see Draft EIR, page 52) and

discussed in greater detail in Section IV.G, Land Use (See Draft EIR, page 158), the project will require a zone variance for the front yard setback requirement from Rinaldi Street. The variance is required to construct the parking lot area and associated landscaping and three-foot perimeter wall to reduce glare impacts on residences across Rinaldi Street. The proposed education building will be set back from the property line over 25 feet and will be terraced with one and two-story roof elevations along the street frontages, with the third story positioned towards the back of the structure. In addition, the proposed retaining walls are located on the interior of the project site and will be substantially shielded from the public vantage points with landscaping features along Shoshone Avenue and Ridgeway Road. The physical characteristics of the existing East Campus and surrounding residential neighborhood is accurately depicted in the Draft EIR in Figures IV.A-1 through IV.A-7, Section IV.A, Aesthetics. The proposed final landscape plan is depicted in Figure IV.C-3 on page 107 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 116.7

b) Item 6: The report states that while the proposed plan is designed to retain the natural topography, it will necessitate retaining walls of 20-40 feet. This does NOT “minimize grading”. Further, under "b" this project should “provide a standard of land use intensity and population density which will be compatible with street capacity” It is evident that this project is NOT compatible with street capacity since changes would need to be made to the existing condition (see Item 9, which discusses widening the existing street to ADD a third lane of southbound traffic). These changes to the existing condition are inconsistent with the intent of Community Plan to keep the area residential.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.7

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. In addition, the fact that the traffic improvements will include providing an additional right-turn only lane does not make the project incompatible with the existing residential community. It should be noted that the future year (2005) post-project traffic conditions (with mitigation improvements) will be an improvement over the existing traffic conditions at the Rinaldi Street/Shoshone Avenue intersection.

COMMENT 116.8

c) Item 9: This states that the proposed project will provide a separate right turn lane on southbound Shoshone Avenue, but there already exists a separate right turn lane. “The project also includes a number of roadway improvements to improve school-related traffic and circulation on adjacent roadways.” The “improvements” deemed necessary

by this EIR include adding a third southbound traffic lane for the last 260 ft of Shoshone north of Rinaldi St modifying the traffic light at that intersection to provide a left-turn only arrow for Eastbound waffle to turn north onto Shoshone. Such 'improvements' belong In a commercial area, or major intersection, NOT in residential neighborhood. THIS WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON THE CHARACTER OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD and as such are inconsistent with the Community Plan.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.8

As provided in Chapter VI of the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan, the Generalized Street And Highways Cross Sections/Types indicate the standard row for a collector street includes a 64-foot right of way, a 10-foot sidewalk, 2 full time-through lanes and 2 full-time bike lanes. The proposed street improvements at the corner of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street will include a 14-foot dedication to an existing 44-foot half-width right-of-way. As such, the total width of the right-of-way would be 58 feet.

With regard to roadway and traffic improvements, the Granada Hills Community plan states:

"Roadways within the Community shall be developed in accordance with standards and criteria contained in the Highways and Freeway Element of the General Plan and the City's Standard Street Dimensions except where environmental issues and planning practices warrant alternate consideration.

Where feasible, highways and local streets shall be expeditiously improved to their greatest capacities to meet the existing and anticipated circulation needs."

The roadway improvements at the corner of Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue have been reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation. As such, it is concluded that the appropriate design standards for a residential collector street have been met and are consistent with the community plan.

COMMENT 116.9

d) Item 10: While this project contains an open space it is not consistent with the intent of this objective since it does not provide publics use of such space except under emergency situations and "time to time" permission for "special" group. It is misleading to imply that this project would promote and encourage recreational use in our community.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.9

The proposed project is not a public use or a public recreational facility. It is a privately owned property which is owned by the project applicant, the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The discussion in the land use analysis with regard to the use of the athletic field by special groups was provided to demonstrate the project applicant's good neighbor policy and relationship with special interest groups in the community, who are in need of recreational areas. It was determined that the project was generally consistent with the Citywide goals and objectives to provide and encourage recreational uses because by allowing special interest groups to use the property as a recreational use, the project is providing a public benefit the community. As a privately held property, which is not zoned or designated as open space or as a public recreational facility, the applicant is not required to meet the recreational needs of the general public. The project is not zoned for such uses and is in fact located within the A1-1-K zoning district. As provided by Section 12.24 U of the Planning and Zoning Code, private schools, elementary and high (kindergarten through 12th grade), are permitted conditional uses within the Agricultural (A1) zone under the authority of the City Planning Commission with Appeals to the City Council. Thus, the project is consistent with the underlying zoning district.

COMMENT 116.10

- Land Use-Housing

a) Item 1; This objective is concerned with the adequacy of the circulation system, both within the area and in peripheral areas to accommodate traffic generated by existing development and by the potential development of the plan. The EIR is inaccurate in its statement that "no significant circulation impacts will occur?"—ask the people who are driving these streets daily. This study does not look at the traffic patterns generated by the existing schools that use this intersection of Rinaldi Sweet and Shoshone Avenue for much of their student traffic. The increase of 1400 trips to the Hillcrest property during peak a.m. hours will have a significant Impact. (See Traffic and Circulation section below.)

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.10

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 116.11

b) Item 3: Discrepancy Concerning the steepness of the topography, this analysis states that retaining walls on the order of 20 feet will be required; however on page 160, under item number 6, it states that there will be “ retaining walls on the order at 20 to 40 feet”.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.11

This comment is correct in the fact that a discrepancy appears in the Draft EIR with regard to the proposed height of the retaining walls. This discrepancy was a typographical error and does not change the conclusions of the Draft EIR. The correct height of the retaining walls was intended to be stated consistently throughout the Draft EIR as “20 to 40 feet”. Notwithstanding this discrepancy, the proposed design and height of the retaining walls has been changed. The new height of the modified retaining wall will not exceed 35 feet in height. For a complete discussion regarding this change to the project, please see Topical Response 1 on page 26. This issue will be clarified in the Corrections and Additions Section of the Final EIR.

COMMENT 116.12

- Land Use-Hillside Development

a) Item 4: Omission: Although, as stated, no horses are kept on any property immediately adjacent to this property, this report fails to take into consideration the nature of the entire area west of Shoshone (west to Zelzah and north to Mayerling). This is a residential to rural area with many horse-keeping properties. This is not true for the east side of Shoshone, where there are NO horse-keeping properties. This report fails to consider the differences in the neighborhoods on the East versus the West side of Shoshone. It is narrow-sighted and inaccurate to state that “this policy is not applicable to the project site.” It is extremely applicable, amid the impact from the increased traffic and congestion will duly impact the horse-keeping properties west of Shoshone. (See Traffic and Circulation section below.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.12

The proposed project will not have any impact on any property with regard to keeping horses. The project site is not within the viewshed of any property that is located within the equine keeping district. Furthermore, as discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of the proposed traffic mitigation measures, traffic impacts created by the proposed project would be reduced to levels below significance. As demonstrated in the project’s traffic analysis, the proposed project would generate traffic to the project site from various directions. However, the project-related traffic would be traveling towards the project site and away from the project site towards regional arterial roadways.

The only project-related traffic that would be generated on Mayerling Street west of Shoshone Avenue would be that of residents who live on Mayerling Street. This is due to the fact that Mayerling Street does not provide through access to any other arterial roadway.

COMMENT 116.13

b) Item b: Again, the inconsistency with the height of the retaining walls. stated here in the 'Project Characteristics' as 20 feet (see "F." above).

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.13

See response 116.11 above.

COMMENT 116.14

- Features

a) Item b: "The Plan proposes that the low density residential character of the Community be preserved, and that single family residential neighborhoods be protected from encroachment by other types of uses." As previously stated, it is inaccurate to conclude that just because this school is well landscaped, it will preserve the rural character of the area. The distinctive character of the area west of Shoshone Avenue (to Zelzah) and north to Mayerling Street will not be maintained by the addition of a two or three story school building and campus.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.14

The distinctive character of the area west of Shoshone Avenue (to Zelzah) and north to Mayerling Street will not be visually impacted by the project because it is not within the viewshed of the proposed project. As discussed in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project is consistent with the underlying zoning and land use designation and is permitted by right under a conditional use permit in the A1-1-K zone.

COMMENT 116.15

- Circulation -Highway and Streets

a) Page 204, Figure IV.J 1-1 Existing Daily Neighborhood Traffic Volumes This figure shows that on September 13, 2001 (the day traffic volume was counted) when all four neighborhood schools were operation there were 2600 more vehicles on Shoshone Ave between Rinaldi Street and Flanders Street than on the August 29, 2001 when none was in session. This accounts for a 30% increase based on total school traffic. However, the street segment of Shoshone between Flanders and Mayerling Streets had only 1150

more cars only a 15% increase. Therefore, there are 1450 vehicles that do not go, or come from, further north on Shoshone than Flanders Street; it's safe to say these cars are not commuting to, or from, St. Euphrasia School or Frost Middle School. It would seem these 1450 cars must have been going to and from Hillcrest Christian Church. Notice that these 1450 cars account for more than half of the total increase in volume on Shoshone Ave between Rinaldi and Flanders ($1450/2600 = 56\%$). Restated ON 9-13-01, HILLCREST CHRISTIAN CHURCH ACCOUNTED FOR 56% OF THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC FROM SCHOOLS BEING IN SESSION ON THE STREET SEGMENT OF SHOSHONE BETWEEN RINALDI AND FLANDERS. Yet this has been ignored in the traffic and circulation analysis. How many cars will need to use this same segment of Shoshone Street in the proposed plan—given the proposed West Campus parking situation and the proposed East Campus drop-off and pick-up from the north parking lot?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.15

The number of peak hour vehicle trips that will use the street segment on Shoshone Avenue between Rinaldi Street and Flanders Avenue is 378 trips during the A.M. and 448 vehicle trips during the P.M. peak hour. The reader is referred to The Project A.M. & P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes graphic depicted in Figure IV.J.10 on page 221 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 116.16

b) The proposed mitigation-widening Shoshone to add a third southbound lane and installing a left turn arrow on east bound Rinaldi St is not valid since the current traffic situation has been inaccurately minimized. Additionally the figures in the "Traffic" section are not p.m.?, and what is the difference between figures IV.J. 15 Ambient ('existing'. per text) AM, & P.M. Peak Hour Traffic volumes (2005) and IV.J.1-6 2005 Pre-Project A.M. & P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes? Seems like they are the same to me, yet the numbers are different.

c) The traffic section fails to explore ways to alleviate the congestion at the intersection of Rinaldi and Shoshone by finding an alternate route to get to Rinaldi Street west bound such as via Mayerling Street to Rexbon to Zelzah.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.17

The proposed and required mitigation measure for the intersection of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street were reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation. The project traffic study has demonstrated that this traffic mitigation improvement will reduce traffic impacts to a level that is less than significant. For the LOS and VC conditions at the Rinaldi Street /

Shoshone Avenue intersection after these improvements are made, the reader is referred to the “With Mitigation” column of Table IV.J.10 on page 223 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 116.18

- The Report is inconsistent when it comes to exploring the alternatives to the project. On one hand it states that the West Campus will function independently from the East Campus, but then it says that it can not locate the secondary school on an alternate site without the East Campus relocating along with it. This, of course, is portrayed as not feasible because it’s more difficult to find a parcel of land to accommodate the additional 800 students already attending the existing camps. This is misleading, when actually this alternative is quite feasible. Councilman Bernson can be helpful in locating alternative properties, that are feasible and within a reasonable area.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.18

The rationale for evaluating and analyzing specific project alternatives is presented in Section VI of the Draft EIR. As a stated goal of the proposed project, it is ideal from an educational perspective to separate the primary grade levels from the high school grade levels. At the same time, many families who have children attending Hillcrest Christian School have children in separate grade levels, including children in both the elementary grade levels and high school grade levels. From this perspective, it is beneficial for the two school sites to be physically separated but geographically close. Moreover, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis provides a reasonable and good faith effort to provide a range of project alternatives that would to some degree attain most of the project objectives, while at the same time reduce environmental impacts.

COMMENT 116.19

- Even a brief review reveals that the Draft EIR does not comply with CEQA. When a reasonable person compares the pros and cons for this project it is evident that the only entity to benefit from this proposed project is the school and the families it serves. It is also evident that the list of detriments to the community in terms of aesthetics, traffic and congestion, noise, reduction of open space, etc. is quite extensive and inconsistent with the Community Plan.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.19

Compliance with CEQA is not predicated on the pros and cons a particular project may have on the community, except for where it involves environmental impacts. The fact that the project is a private project with specific goals aimed at serving the families who choose to send their children to the school is irrelevant with regard to CEQA compliance.

Consistency with the General Plan was discussed in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. Project impacts with regard to aesthetics, traffic congestion, and noise would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. The project is not zoned for open space uses and thus would not result in the loss of any area designated or zoned for open space uses. In fact, as discussed in Section IV.G Land Use, the project is consistent with the underlying zoning as school uses are conditionally approved uses within the A1-1-K zone.

COMMENT 116.20

- The traffic analysis shows that more than 43% of the students come from west of Zelzah Avenue while 25% come via the 118 freeway from east of Balboa Boulevard. Clearly more than 68% of the proposed student population is NOT from the surrounding neighborhood.; yet it is this neighborhood that will bear the brunt of these environmental impacts.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.20

This comment does not raise any specific challenge to the adequacy of the EIR. The traffic impacts were determined on the approved methodology of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation. As evaluated in the context of the adopted significance thresholds, traffic impacts would be below significance thresholds with implementation of the required mitigation measures.

COMMENT 116.21

- Hillcrest Christian School currently operates a K-12 school with a full enrollment of 800 students. This is sufficient for this neighborhood. Actually, after reading this report, it seems that an 800 student capacity on the existing East Campus property is an over-extension, especially given the parking and traffic situation. However, it is already here, so it must be accepted. But this proposed expansion is unnecessary and unwarranted given the environmental impact, especially as related to the proposed Alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.21

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT 116.22

There are many more issues than I can adequately address here due to the time constraints of the deadline today, August 6, 2001. I am hopeful the deadline for these comments will be extended since even our Councilman's office did not have a copy of this Draft EIR as of Monday, July 30, 2001; I

learned this from Phyllis Winger, who represents Councilman Bernson on this matter.

It is evident that this Draft Environmental Impact Report is more concerned with pushing this project through than accurately determining its impact on our environment.

Please place this letter into the official records of the City of Los Angeles.

I respectfully ask for your response to each issue.

Thank you for your consideration in this most important matter

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 116.22

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines). This comment letter and the responses provided to address each of the comments raised in this letter are incorporated into the record.

COMMENT LETTER No. 117

Kara Tosti
10406 Hayvenhurst Ave.
Granada Hills, Ca 91344
August 4, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 117.1

As parents of a child who attends Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the proposed project #CPC 201-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

With the EIR draft completed, we strongly believe the said project must move forward to fill the need for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has established itself as a good neighbor working with the community to solve whatever problems as they might arise. Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

As the population of our community in this area continues to grow, our desire is that Hillcrest Christian School will assist in meeting this important need.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 117.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 118

Don Vickers
429 Emerald Bay Drive
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
August 1, 2001

RE: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU Dear Mr: Liao,

COMMENT 118.1

I have lived and worked most of my life in the San Fernando Valley. Driving down the freeway I am somewhat dismayed at the replacement of many green belt areas with housing tracts and retail centers. As a grandparent of a student at Hillcrest Christian School, the only development I would like to support is the expansion. of the Hillcrest School. It is very difficult for families living in the Valley to find quality affordable education for their children. The impact of the school expansion is very different than that of housing or retail and the value to the community is immeasurable.

I would like to ask the City of Los Angeles, to expedite this project so that the Hillcrest School can continue to move forward filling the need for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. I believe Hillcrest has shown itself as a good neighbor reaching out to help this community.

Thank you for your consideration of this very important project.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 118.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 119

Michelle A. Villa
E.W. Thorn Refrigeration Corp.
11633 Tuxford St.
Sun Valley, CA 91352
August 1, 2001

Re: Case #CPC 2001-2608

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 119.1

As a parent, business person and resident of the area, I would like to express my support for the above referenced project for the Hillcrest School located at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

Having been through the Corbin expansion and growth of the area, I can honestly say that the only meaningful development of the area is to allow this school project. Hillcrest has established themselves as a good neighbor to the community.

As the population of this area continues to grow, it is essential to have quality education for the families of the north San Fernando Valley. This is a school that will continue to be an asset of the community unlike the mega shopping center and strip malls that plague our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 119.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 120

Barbara Vispi
16919 Marlin Place
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Date: August 5, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 120.1

My son is a student at Hillcrest Christian School. I wanted to write to show my support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

With the draft EIR completed, I believe that this project should immediately move forward to fill the incredible need for additional room in one of the quality education facilities in the north end of the San Fernando valley. Hillcrest Christian School has continued to show the community that it has been very cognizant of the surrounding neighbors' concerns and has worked diligently to solve problems as they might arise. Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also help improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

Hillcrest Christian School is a wonderful asset to the community because of the fine, quality students that attend. With the population in the San Fernando Valley rapidly growing, the completion of this project would assist in meeting a very important need of the community.

Thank you for your professional courtesy and consideration in this matters.

Very truly yours,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 120.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 121

Mrs. Karnel R. Watkins
12633 Bradford Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 25, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 121.1

I am writing to you as a parent, as well as a neighbor of Hillcrest Christian School. For 14 years my husband and I have lived in this area. For the past 7 years we have sent all three of our sons to Hillcrest. We are very strong supporters of the proposed project #CPC 200 1-2608 at 17531 Rinaldi Street in Granada Hills.

I cannot stress enough, the urgent need for this project to rapidly move forward and be completed. With the thousands of new homes being built, and so many more projected in the north end of the San Fernando Valley, the urgency for quality schools is tantamount to a crisis in our area. In addition, the proposed project will alleviate the traffic problems we have during prime commuter times

Hillcrest Christian School has an impeccable reputation. They do wonderful things for our community, all the while teaching our children to give back to the community and strive to make a difference in our society. Mr. Liao, I urge you, if you have not already, to take a few hours out of your very busy schedule to visit the existing campus. I truly believe that you will be very impressed by the student body and staff at Hillcrest. Then, I have no doubt, you will agree that moving forward, as quickly as possible with the expansion project will be beneficial to our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 121.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 122

Kevin and Whitney Watkins
23616 Via Clasico
Valencia, CA 91355
Received August 7, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 122.1

This letter is to express our **support** for the project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

As parents of two children who attend Hillcrest Christian School, we feel that there is a need to expand our Christian school to provide quality education in this part of the San Fernando Valley. In the 10 years that we have been associated with Hillcrest, it has proven to be open to community needs as well as going the extra mile to be good neighbors.

The Hillcrest Christian School project would be an asset to this community because of its diligence in providing quality education and the care it takes to instill values to all students, which would ultimately provide good citizens in this community.

Thank you for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 122.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 123

Nancy Weiss
20200 Acre Street
Winnetka, CA 91306
August 1, 2001

Ref: Case # CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 123.1

I am the parent of a student who attends Hillcrest Christian School, and I would like to urge you to move forward with the proposed expansion of the school. Hillcrest has had a very positive effect on son. Not only has he learned academically, but he has also grown in his desire to “get beyond self” and reach out to those around him in a positive way. This is true of the majority of students that I have observed. We are in desperate need to have schools of this caliber around, schools that minister to the whole student, not just to the mere academic needs.

Hillcrest also goes beyond the needs of its students and reaches out to the community as well. I am sure you are aware of the school’s interactions with the Rotary Club, and its hosting the annual S.O.L.I.D. dinner which benefits our police department. Through the school’s example, the students are learning to become more active in their respective communities.

With the large influx of housing taking place north of Rinaldi Street and west of Tampa Avenue, this area is ripe for additional school space. I think you would agree that Hillcrest actively teaches its students to become productive members of our community.

Thank you in advance for the time you have given to this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 123.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 124

Walter and Marianne Wilson
17900 Mayerling Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
June 27, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 124.1

We have recently received your letter regarding project 99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA, the proposed expansion of Hillcrest School. We are very concerned about the zone variance to allow the reduction parking and the reduction of the 25-foot setback. This would put a tremendous strain on our neighborhood and its roads and streets. The neighborhood was never designed to accommodate the density of traffic that has

occurred in the past few years. The increase in the building of new homes has already made a negative impact in the quality of life for the residents. To now be asked to have an additional 162 cars parked on our narrow streets is inconceivable, Shoshone is a very narrow street and would be the main thoroughfare for 3 schools in the area. St. Euphrasia School on Mayerling and Shoshone, and Frost Jr. High and of course Hill Crest School all use that street on a daily basis. This is in addition to the thousands of homes that exist north of Rinaldi, all looking for an exit down the hill. I implore you and your committee to consider the whole neighborhood when you make your decision. The loss of three hundred trees, the tremendous increase in noise, the potential danger in an emergency such as a fire, flood, or earthquake when thousands are trying to flee the area are reasons to reduce the scope of the Hill Crest expansion. For these reasons we ask you to not grant the variance that would disrupt and destroy the fabric of our neighborhood.

Most concerned citizens,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 124.1

The project's parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The proposed project will provide adequate parking to meet the daily operational parking demand of the project. 124 new parking spaces will be provided in a surface parking lot on the West Campus. It is estimated that with the use of a temporary overflow parking area, up to 402 parking spaces could be provided on-site during special events. The Draft EIR concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. The Draft EIR further concluded a significant and unavoidable parking impact may occur as a result of school-related special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year.

The loss of trees were addressed in Section IV.C, Biological Resources, beginning on page 97 of the Draft EIR. Noise impacts are addressed in Section IV.H, beginning on page 172 of the Draft EIR. Geotechnical Hazards are addressed in Section IV.D, beginning on page 111 of the Draft EIR. Impacts associated with Fire Safety are addressed in Section IV.I.2, Fire Protection. As discussed in each of these respective Sections of the Draft EIR, no unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated for any of these environmental issue areas.

COMMENT LETTER No. 125

Mr. and Mrs. R.A. Wirffel
11933 Nugent Drive
Granada Hills, CA 91344
June 25, 2001

Re: EIR-#99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Sir;

COMMENT 125.1

This report clearly shows that this project will significantly effect: our neighborhood aesthetics (sic), traffic, noise, land use and home planning and historic sites!!+ + +

I live on Nugent Dr., there are seven (7) schools and churches within a 1 mile radius and up and down Nugent Dr. Plus all the people using Nugent Dr. as a short cut from Santa Clarita to the Valley to bypass Balboa. This project is not a neighborhood school, it is a "business"! Most students attending are not in the neighborhood or neighbors.

Regards,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 125.1

All of the issues referenced above (i.e., aesthetics, traffic, noise, land use and historic sites, are addressed in the Draft EIR. No significant immitigable impacts are anticipated to occur with respect to any of these issue areas. No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines.

COMMENT LETTER No. 126

Joy Wu
17069 Mayerling St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 18, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 126.1

Thank you for informing us of the availability of the EIR report. To be honest, I have not seen the report. I feel there is no way I can understand all that the report entails, all the details. Throughout this ENTIRE process, from the application for a Conditional Use Permit by the school to the Zone Variance for parking, the main and primary concern has been the traffic congestion the school will have on the ENTIRE neighborhood north of Rinaldi.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines. For a discussion of the project traffic impacts the reader is referred to Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 126.2

It is apparent to all who live here that this project will proceed. Mr. Bernson is pushing forward on it and the school has the monies to see it through. It is the neighbors that will have to endure even more of the traffic nightmare for 9 months every year. I have no doubt that some of the parents of the school have been involved in traffic accidents right on Rinaldi. They continue to make illegal U-turns even with "No U-turn" signs posted. They cut out into traffic, they double park on Rinaldi to let their children out or they just park on Rinaldi with the rear end of their cars sticking out onto Rinaldi to let their children off. Can you imagine the problems with even more students and parents and staff?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 126.3

Here are some issues that I would like to see addressed and clarified and put in writing:

1) THE final Maximum number of students that will be allowed. The school has a history of asking for more and more! Where is the limit? Right now they want to increase to 1200 students. Is that FINAL, or will they be asking for 1500. 1800, 2000 students in the years to come?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.3

The present application submitted for this project includes a request to increase the maximum student capacity of the school to 1,200 students, an increase of 400 students over the existing capacity as enumerated in Hillcrest School's existing CUP for the East Campus. Accordingly, this EIR evaluates the project's impacts on a total student capacity of 1,200 students between the two campuses combined. Any requests to increase the proposed student capacity will be evaluated in accordance with the City's Planning and Zoning Code and CEQA.

COMMENT 126.4

2) Where is the parking overflow going to be located? There is NO possible way to accommodate 130 staff (does that include workers, volunteers etc.), high school students on the parking lots currently proposed! Will the overflow be on Rinaldi? Certainly the overflow WILL not be all over the neighborhood! There MUST be no parking on either side of Shoshone from Rinaldi to Flanders. ANY vehicles parked there, especially during the hours of 630 am - 830 am and 230 PM 430 PM will only worsen the current congestion problem!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.4

An overflow parking plan was presented in Section IV.J.2 of the Draft EIR. The reader is referred to Figure IV.J.2-2, Proposed Overflow Parking Plan, on page 241 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 126.5

3) The east-west pedestrian traffic (high school and elementary kids) will NO DOUBT increase at Shoshone/Rinaldi. As current traffic is already horribly impacted by the school in it's present size, when pedestrian traffic increases between the east and west campus, the north-south flow of traffic on Shoshone will definitely be even more negatively impacted as autos now must wait for pedestrians, and we ALL know how that can be! Pedestrian traffic should NOT be allowed at Rinaldi/Shoshone. Crosswalks should be at White Oak/Rinaldi, Encino/Rinaldi! Children crossing at Rinaldi/Shoshone are taking a risk! There are too many fast cars and with the new high school, teen age drivers!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.5

Section IV.J.1, Traffic, of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts associated with increased student activity at the corner of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street. As stated in the Draft EIR, Hillcrest

School will incorporate pedestrian safety measures into their standard daily operating procedures. With implementation of the required mitigation measures, project impacts on pedestrian safety would be less than significant. These measures are addressed on pages 230 and 232 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 126.6

4) When there are activities in their athletic field, where will all those cars park? How late will those activities be allowed to proceed? Will the school incur fines should they fail to adhere to ANY and ALL regulations, WITHOUT exceptions, including any organizations to whom they choose to lease/rent the facility. The issue of stadium lights and out door audio system should be FINALIZED now. The neighborhood does NOT want to continuously wonder when those intrusions will be implemented against our will and knowledge! THERE SHOULD BE NO VARIANCE or ALLOWANCE for such intrusions in such close proximity to homes!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.6

The Draft EIR is based on the present application that Hillcrest Christian School and Church has submitted to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department. The Project Description is stated in Section III of the Draft EIR. There is no current plan for the proposed athletic field to function as a regulation football stadium. The size and the configuration of the project site precludes the development of such a stadium on the property. Should the current plans change, or should the project applicant submit additional plans for development in the future that are not covered under this project proposal and/or EIR, such plans will be subject to additional environmental review in accordance with CEQA. As a private and conditionally permitted school use, the Hillcrest Christian School will be responsible for complying with all of the conditions of approval set forth by the Decision-Maker. Therefore, since conditional uses are revocable if the conditions of approval are not met, it is in the best interest of the school to monitor all of its activities and programs to minimize conflicts within the community.

COMMENT 126.7

5) How will traffic onto and from the west campus be controlled? Will there be mad dashes onto traffic and through traffic, especially during peak traffic hours? Will there be left turns allowed off the west campus onto Rinaldi? If so, that will be a very dangerous situation! As you MUST be aware, during peak school traffic hours, the Rinaldi left turn lane, trying to turn north onto Shoshone from Rinaldi can OFTEN be full, all the way to White Oak.

Therefore, anyone trying to go east on Rinaldi from the west campus will have trouble.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.7

The project's traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures,

traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 126.8

6) There should be NO activity onto the east campus parking lot from the Shoshone St. side during peak hour traffic hours. Currently, when the cars try to exit and enter the Shoshone St. east campus parking lot, it creates a traffic jam on Shoshone that negatively impacts traffic on Shoshone and even Rinaldi.

7) The school currently runs their east campus carpool on the Rinaldi, effectively closing that section of the bike lane in the mornings and afternoon (do they have a permit to do that every day). This carpool line (sic) also impacts the egress and ingress at Andasol and Rinaldi. They will sometimes block the intersection. Will they be allowed block (sic) the bike lanes on Rinaldi on the West Campus?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.8

The project's traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 126.9

school's parents already create dangerous traffic situations (I have called the school many times to inform them. They are aware but cannot control the parents.) which I expect will not change! The additional staff cars and teen age drivers, the parking congestion will only worsen an already bad traffic situation. AND there is no doubt in my mind, the school will be continuously looking to expand more and more! Where does it end? Who will take a stand for the neighbors?

Once we allow this Pandora Box of potential problems out and the worst of situations results, who will help rectify the situation? Who will have to suffer in the end. I can assure you, it will not be the city council members nor the school staff and students, nor the people who will eventually grant all the permits and variances. It will be the neighbors who pay the taxes that pay you, the city workers, who will have to endure the results of poor planning and poor judgement (sic). Please someone take note of the basic needs of the tax payer and our quality of life. All I ask is someone take an honest long look and the situation. Studies by hired companies do not speak the truth. They are only numbers. We are people! Thank you.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 126.9

This comment does not address the adequacy of the DEIR; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines. The impacts of the proposed project, as defined in Section III Project Description, were adequately analyzed and disclosed in the Draft EIR in accordance with

CEQA. As concluded in the EIR, all of the project's traffic impacts would be reduced to levels that are less than significant with implementation of the required mitigation measures.

COMMENT LETTER No. 127

H. Zakary and Eugenia Zeitlin
20124 Phaeton Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
August 2, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 200 1-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 127.1

We are the parents of a Down syndrome daughter who is employed as a part-time teacher's aid at the Hillcrest Christian School. We would like to take this opportunity to express our support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608CU at 177531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344. During visits to the campus we have been impressed with the beauty and cleanliness of the campus, the orderliness of the student body, the helpfulness of everyone we met, and the stress on values we of all religions hold dear.

Hillcrest School is a tremendous asset to the community right now. A well-developed secondary school will help form the character of many young people who will go on to become desirable adult leaders, giving back to their neighborhoods their talents.

Finally, the willingness of Hillcrest's administration, which practices diversity, to employ our disabled daughter, indicates the spirit that moves this school to achieve its goals. We need that spirit! Space to grow - surely as a good neighbor Hillcrest Christian School deserves this consideration.

Respectfully yours,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 127.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 128

Anne Ziliak
17124 Lisette St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 6, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 128.1

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me last week. I have some questions and comments on the DEIR for the expansion of Hillcrest school. Will everyone that turns in comments be notified when the Response to Comment are completed? If not where can we find out the date for hearings etc. on this issue?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 128.1

All future notices and hearing dates will be disclosed and announced to the public in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. The commentor will be placed on the project's mailing list and will be notified of future hearing dates. Subsequent to the completion of the Final EIR, notification of the hearing dates will be made in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

COMMENT 128.2

At this time I would like to request an extension for the comment period on the above referenced DEIR and a copy of the DEIR. I am a member of a large community group in that area that will be most directly impacted by this project and members have had very little time to look at this DEIR. I had to borrow one and only had a limited time to read and form questions to submit. With the limited time I do have a few comments and questions.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 128.2

The Draft EIR was made available for public review via several different formats including: hard copies were available at the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning counters (at the downtown and valley office locations), the public library, and the internet. The public review period was held for a 45 day time period as required by CEQA. As such, the Department of City Planning did not extend the comment period. However, all comments received after the comment period ended were incorporated into the Final EIR.

COMMENT 128.3

The variance for the parking at the school is a serious concern for all the residents that live in the surrounding neighborhoods. Why should Hillcrest be allowed to only have 124 spaces? Will these spaces accommodate large cars? I can not understand why such a small number of spaces for such a large study body. As a teenager driving to school was both a necessity and a privilege I could not wait to have. What is planned to lessen the impact that the cars that do not fit into the parking area have on the Adult school on the South side of Rinaldi? Have you considered placing no parking at any time signs around the neighborhoods? When my child's school of approximately 600 has an event parking is almost impossible, the surrounding neighborhood gets quite upset. These events are only temporary unlike the Hillcrest project. What will be done when both Hillcrest and Saint Eurphrasia, a school just a few blocks north on Shoshone, have events on the same day. This is sure to happen on holidays, graduations, etc.?

I can only imagine how flooded that the Devonshire division will be when a neighbor can not get around a car or if that can not get mail deliver because a car is parked in front of mailboxes. Have you provided any mitigation for this? I suggest that all areas in front of mailboxes be painted red to avoid that inconvenience to the neighbors. Also, parking restrictions can be posted to discourage parking in the residential areas.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 128.3

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The project's parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. The Draft EIR further concluded a significant and unavoidable parking impact may occur as a result of school-related special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year.

In accordance with the mitigation measure to widen Shoshone Avenue to create a through right-turn only lane, parking restrictions will be placed along Shoshone within the 200-foot approach of Rinaldi Street. Mitigation measures have also been implemented to control student parking on-site. Based on the parking demand presented in the traffic impact study, the project will include adequate parking for student drivers. In addition, mitigation measures have been set forth to limit the number of student drivers should the actual demand exceed the projected demand and a student parking plan will be implemented to control students parking on residential streets in the surrounding neighborhood. For a discussion of the student parking plan, please see the Topical Response 5 on page 31.

COMMENT 128.4

Another issue of concern is the distance to the Fire Station as mentioned in the DEIR. It says that Fire Station 18 is 1.48 miles from the school. The code LAMC section 57.09.07 according to the DEIR states, “that the maximum response distance from an engine company should be 1.5 miles”. The actual distance between the school expansion and the Fire Department #18 is closer to 2.0 miles by road. What was used to measure the distance of 1.48 miles?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 128.4

The 1.8 mile response distance from Fire Department #18 and the proposed project site was provided by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department. The reader is referred to the City of Los Angeles Fire Department’s Inter-Departmental Correspondence addressed to Con Howe, Director of City Planning dated July 19, 2001. This correspondence was submitted in response to the NOP and is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 128.5

Traffic on Rinaldi right now at Hillcrest is very congested during drop off and pick up times and the bike lanes on the north side are used as a car pool lane and are inaccessible to bikes, is that an issue? Many drivers that drop off and pick up students do not obey traffic rules, they make illegal u-turns and obstruct the intersection of Andasol Street and Rinaldi. Will the car pool remain at the same location for grades K-8?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 128.4

The West Campus driveway entrance will provide full access, both left and right turn entry and exiting, on to and from Rinaldi Street. Therefore, the West Campus site will be fully accessible from Rinaldi without the reorientation of traffic to comply with a right turn only entering and exiting access pattern. The project proposes to improve the general circulation patters on the local area roadways during drop off and pick up activities.

COMMENT LETTER No. 129

Sue Ogg
11986 Shoshone Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
September 10, 2001

Re: EIR case Number 99-0421 (CUZ)(ZU)(YV) Hillcrest School Expansion

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 129.1

The enclosed letter was sent to neighbors concerning the building of a high school at Rinaldi and Shoshone Avenues. I live at 11986 Shoshone Avenue, which is north of Hillcrest Christian School.

The points made by the local resident make sense to me. I am particularly concerned about increased traffic and noise in our quite neighborhood. Because of this, I am very opposed to the expansion plan of Hillcrest School.

Please read the enclosed letter and see what you can do to stop this unwelcome building of a high school in our area.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 129.1

The enclosed letter of reference that was attached to this commentors letter is the community form letter submitted by multiple respondents. This community form letter is identified as Comment Letter No. 11. For a response to all of the "points" made by the local resident in the community form letter, please refer to the individual responses to Comment Letter No 11.