

COMMENT LETTER No. 11

The following form letter was circulated within the community and has been signed and submitted to the City Planning Department by various individuals. In total, 19 identical form letters were received by the following individuals:

Name	Address	Date
Sonny Agbede	17908 Mayerling St.	Received August 9, 2001
Orfeo and Ana Maria Branchesl	17535 Flanders St.	No Date
Gloria Competelli	17554 Flanders St.	No Date
M.F. Dormah	12025 Nugent Dr.	Received August 28, 2001
Linda and George Edington	11557 Encino Ave.	No Date
Craig A. Fox	12130 Nugent Drive	Received August 8, 2001
Edmond & Janna Gregoryona	11716 Shoshone Ave.	Received September 4, 2001
Mary Heermann	17563 Flanders St.	Received August 8, 2001
I Nan Hsu	12007 Nugent Dr.	No Date
Judy and Renee Jargas	12222 Nugent Dr.	Received August 21, 2001
Kaethe Jaz	17580 Regency Way	Received August 21, 2001
Violet Landowski	11780 Encino Ave.	No Date
Fred Lipman	12162 Nugent Dr.	No Date
Danny Markoe	11845 Jellico Ave.	No Date
Alex G. Martinez	11933 Nugent Dr.	August 10, 2001
Peter and Teri Meichtry	17916 Mayerling St.	No Date
Richard A. Raecker	11821 Jellico Ave.	Received August 24, 2001
Steven and Ellen Ruggieri	12018 Nugent Drive	Received October 4, 2001
Fred Sabine	12169 Nugent Dr.	Received August 8, 2001
Robert, Jennifer, Virginia Wirfell	11933 Nugent Drive.	August 9, 2001
Kenneth and Rose Zaucha	11848 Jellico Ave.	No Date

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

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 11.1

This letter is to strenuously protest the proposed project. I live at [addresses filled in by respondents].

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.1

All 20 individuals who submitted this form letter expressing opposition to the project are noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision -Maker for their consideration.

COMMENT 11.2

1. This is a residential neighborhood. There are already five schools which directly impact Nugent Drive: Frost Junior High School; Hillcrest; Montessori preschool at White Oak and Rinaldi; St. Euphrasia, the catholic school at Shoshone and Mayerling, and the adult school at Rinaldi and Encino.

The traffic, both mornings and afternoons is already ridiculous. Sometimes there are as many as 10 cars backed up at the stop sign at Louise and Nugent just going north. Cars are making U-turns midblock in front of the Catholic school, Hillcrest and Frost Junior High as well as in front of my house and other neighbors. Cars are already parking along Shoshone daily. U-turns in driveways have clipped three mailboxes in the last year alone within 400 feet of the Louise intersection.

No residential area should have to deal with this level of traffic. The proposal will make it worse. At the times of school opening and closing, it is almost impossible to drive down Shoshone, Nugent and Rinaldi due to all of the parents dropping off and picking up their children. I can't back out of my own driveway without waiting 10 or 15 minutes.

EVERY TRAFFIC STUDY THAT HAS BEEN DONE ON OR AROUND THE INTERSECTION OF RINALDI AND SHOSHONE, HAS BEEN DONE WHEN SCHOOL WAS NOT IN SESSION.

ALL TRAFFIC STUDIES AT THIS INTERSECTION GIVE FALSE RESULTS!

ANY ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT WHICH RELIES UPON THOSE STUDIES IS NECESSARILY FLAWED

AFTER RESIDENTS PROTESTED THE TRAFFIC STUDIES DURING THE LAST ROUND OF PUBLIC COMMENTS, ANOTHER TRAFFIC STUDY WAS DONE---THE COUNTERS WERE ACROSS THE STREETS WHILE HILLCREST WAS CLOSED FOR A

VACATION PERIOD. WHEN SCHOOL REOPENED, THE COUNTERS WERE REMOVED!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.2

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. It should be noted that project traffic volumes on Nugent Drive are accounted for with the traffic counts and post project traffic projections for Shoshone Avenue. Shoshone Avenue turns into Nugent Drive approximately 1 mile north of the project site, north of Highwater Road.

COMMENT 11.3

2. The three houses at Rinaldi and Shoshone ought to qualify as historic- inasmuch as they purportedly date back to the era when Jimmy Cagney owned most of this area. This area retains much of its semi-rural feel due to these houses and the mature trees. **THIS PROJECT CALLS FOR THE REMOVAL OF EVERY MATURE TREE ON THE NORTH WEST CORNER LOTS AT RINALDI AND SHOSHONE, AND REPLACING THOSE 30 AND 40 FOOT TALL TREES WITH 5 ACRES OF ASPHALT AND BUILDINGS!**

Replacement trees (which are likely to be 6 feet tall in 15 gallon cans) will take at least 20 years to obtain any resemblance to the present heavily wooded site. These mature trees provide a major buffer to noise, dirt, and exhaust fumes for the homes above Rinaldi.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.3

The issue of historic resources is discussed in Section IV.E of the Draft EIR. All three houses referred to in this comment were investigated by Teresa Grimes, Historic Preservation for an analysis of historical significance. As stated in Section IV.E. Historic Resources of the Draft EIR, the residences at 11515 Shoshone Avenue and 11525 Shoshone Avenue were determined to not be historic resources

because they lack the physical integrity requisite for listing in the California Register. As such, the demolition of these structures would not be considered a significant impact. The residential structure identified at 17551 Rinaldi Street, however, is eligible for listing in the California Register as a historic resource under Criteria A. This structure is also potentially eligible for designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument. The Hillcrest Christian School has continued to pursue the relocation method as a way to reduce the project's historic impact to a less than significant level. Through continued discussions with the SFVHS, a mitigation plan to relocate this structure has been formalized and agreed between both parties. See Topical Response 3 on page 28.

With regard to tree removal and replacement, please see Section IV.C, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR. The modifications to the proposed retaining wall (see Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR) would avoid the complete grading of the site and will retain approximately 22 trees in place in the northwestern portion of the project site. Additionally, the tree replacement program is consistent with the City's Landscape Ordinance and will include replanting all desirable non-oak trees on a 1:1 ratio. A total of 162 trees are proposed to be planted on and adjacent to the West Campus as part of this mitigation effort. As stated on page 109 of the Draft EIR, replacement trees will be required to be a minimum of 24-inch box trees. Oak trees are protected under the City's Oak Tree Ordinance and they will be transplanted or replaced on a higher ratio of 2:1 in accordance with the Ordinance.

COMMENT 11.4

3. Five feet parking setback: This is a residential-not commercial area. This proposal will directly turn a visually residential area into acres of asphalt-with no relief-either visual or from noise, fumes. It violates the General Plan and Specific Plan.

The North side of Rinaldi has only one commercial structure of any kind, from Balboa Blvd. West to Porter Ranch. THIS SCHOOL. Presently, the Elementary School at Hillcrest nestles into a low spot, below homes, and occupies a visually small area. Even so, Hillcrest School officials have not seen fit to maintain the residential nature of the area by planting trees along Rinaldi, they have built a 10 foot tall fence along Shoshone, and tried to disguise it with now dying cypress trees, and they have paved the entire rear portion of the existing school grounds. There have never been any attempts to adequately landscape their slopes; nor to fit the design of the school into the residential character of the neighborhood. If past history is any guide, the same will happen in any enlarged area. Trees and shrubs and grass do not pay bills—economics will dictate that the school focus on Revenue raising—not spending to maintain grounds.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.4

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. 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 11.5

4. It is important for the City to realize that Hillcrest is no longer a church-except when it is rented to a Korean congregation on Sundays. The Hillcrest congregation merged with Shepard of the Hills-on Rinaldi in Porter Ranch. They have acres and acres of land there with wide streets, freeway access, commercial properties immediately adjacent. There would be no impact on residences if the school was there.

HILLCREST HAS AN ALTERNATIVE WITH ZERO IMPACT.

WHY SHOULD THEY BE ALLOWED TO PROCEED TO DESTROY THE WOODED ENTRANCE TO A COMPLETELY RESIDENTIAL AREA WITHOUT ANY CONSIDERATION OF THE EFFECT ON THAT AREA?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.5

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.

The Shepard of the Hills property at 19700 Rinaldi Street was evaluated as a potential alternative site, however, and was dismissed as a viable alternative for the reasons outlined in the Draft EIR. As stated in the discussion on page 259 of the Draft EIR, the Shepherd of the Hills Church site is not owned by the Hillcrest Christian School and the Shepherd of the Hills organization is not interested in dividing or

selling any property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church inquired with the Shepherd of the Hills organization regarding the future use of that site. Shepherd of the Hills indicated that any division of their property would preclude any future plans for their expansion of services. Therefore, they are not interested in selling any of their property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. For these reasons, this alternative site location was dismissed since it is not a potentially feasible site.

COMMENT 11.6

5. This entire school project has developed gradually over the years bit by bit, slowly encroaching on zoning laws. First it was the addition of a “Sunday School.” Then that “Sunday School” morphed into a “pre-school.” Then the “pre-school” expanded to become an “elementary school”, Now it seeks to transform completely to a full 12 year school-wedged into an area that is too small to meet State of California requirements for even an elementary school. This gradual “creeping expansion” lulls people, residents school officials, and government officials into allowing an end result which NEVER would be permitted had it all been proposed at once. There is no question that Hillcrest is successful at attracting students. There is no doubt that it will continue to be successful. What is the next expansion? When will they ask permission to add lights so they can practice sports in the evenings? When will that turn into nighttime football games? When will that develop into basketball, and other nighttime sport events. When will they discover that they really need additional classroom space to handle all of the Students—and where will they park their cars then?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.6

The State of California Education Code has established recommended school property sizes and development standards for public schools. These recommended guidelines do not apply to private institutions, such as the Hillcrest Christian School, as they are not funded by government taxes.

Nighttime athletic events are not proposed as part of the project’s operations. Other than minimal security lighting features, no outdoor lighting is proposed anywhere on the campus. The current proposal includes the construction of a 75,000 square foot education building with a total of 1,200 students combined on the East and West Campuses.

COMMENT 11.7

These questions do not raise a fantasy—it is exactly what has already happened. The obvious answer is to place the High School in a different location—where it can grow. The obvious solution is further West on Rinaldi, at Shepard of the Hills Church. The parking lot there is enormous—there is little use during the daytime, except on Sundays—when the school would be closed. There is additional open land there for sport facilities, for school buildings, and for any other use that might be determined in the future, There are no homes which would be impacted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.7

As discussed in Section VI, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, a total of five alternative locations were sought as potential site to develop the West Campus expansion project. Ultimately, due to a number of reasons outlined in that discussion, each of those alternative locations, including the Shepard of the Hills property were deemed to be unavailable for purchase.

COMMENT 11.8

Most educators do not support combining all 12 grades, plus pre-school, in one location. Why should Hillcrest be allowed to seriously damage a neighborhood by doing so? The age and developmental differences of children and teenagers in particular have repeatedly shown that children do better in an environment which is limited to their own age groups.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.8

The age and developmental differences of children and teenagers is the main reason Hillcrest is pursuing a campus expansion plan that would separate the students by grade level. Currently, students in grades K-12th grade are served by a single campus. Under the proposal the West Campus will serve the upper grade levels and the East Campus will serve the lower grade levels. As stated by the comment, it is desirable and beneficial to the education process, to separate the lower school grade levels from the higher grade levels. This separation will be provided by the expansion of the West Campus. Under the proposed expansion plan, each campus will be self sufficient, eliminating the need for students to cross through both campuses on a daily basis. Both campuses would be served by their own cafeteria, play area, gymnasium, library, and administrative offices. While some special events may involve students from one campus visiting the opposite campus, that would not be a part of normal day to day operations. Such occurrences would be limited to special assemblies and similar events held in the auditorium.

COMMENT 11.9

6. When has any other business-and that is what a private school is- been allowed to get away with only 52% of the required parking? This is absurd. It will put 231 parked cars on the residential streets. No one will be able to park in front of their own homes! THE EXISTING PARKING LOT IS FULL NOW! JUST HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO SHARE PARKING FROM THE NEW AREA TO THE EXISTING LOT? Do they plan to double deck the parking? Wouldn't that be appropriate in a residential neighborhood? What happens when the high school students decide to drive to school? Where will they park? How will the school even know that they are driving? How can the school control where they park?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.9

As provided by the mitigation measures on page 242 of the Draft EIR, the applicant will be required to limit student driving by providing limit parking passes for a maximum of 56 parking spaces. Under this approach the school has the ability to control the parking demand to ensure adequate parking supply is available for staff, administrators, and visitors. Students will not be allowed to park on nearby streets. Furthermore, it should be noted that the code required parking for high schools is based on maximum attendance at the theater or gymnasium building. The use of the gymnasium building to its full capacity would not be a part of daily operations. Rather, such use would be reserved for school events involving parent attendance such as basketball or volleyball games, award ceremonies or school presentations. Under this scenario, and the more conservative assumption that the gymnasium could accommodate 1,000 people with 2.5 people per car, a total of 400 parking spaces was estimated to be required. Hillcrest has demonstrated that it could provide up to 402 parking spaces on a temporary basis, as the need arises, by parking cars on a designated overflow parking area on the northern athletic field of the East Campus. As such, the code required parking demand would be met during peak parking demand times. Nevertheless, 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.

COMMENT 11.10

7. Isn't it interesting that the "playing field" is just the size of a football field? When do they submit the request for bleachers and lights and nighttime football games?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.10

The proposed athletic field is not large enough to accommodate regulation high school football games and will not include any nighttime lighting to support activities after dusk. Under current operations, Hillcrest contracts with other local schools in the area to play athletic events on their playing fields. Because the project site is not large enough to accommodate regulation football games, and no nighttime lighting is proposed, such events will continue to be held at off-site locations. In addition, 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 11.11

Where do they plan to park cars for basketball and football games? They certainly can't park on the playing field then. This is not a viable solution to the parking problem—it is completely unrealistic and short-sighted. Any groundskeeper in Griffith Park can tell you that parking cars on the grass (as near the Greek Theater) destroys the grass, and compacts the ground to the point that grass will not re-grow—much less the damage caused by oils etc., to the ground.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.11

The project includes an overflow parking plan to accommodate high parking demands of special events. For the specific details of this plan, please refer to Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The overflow parking plan would utilize the northern athletic field on the East Campus, which will provide up to 130 additional parking spaces. The use of this field as a parking area would only occur during special events when peak parking demand is anticipated. Hillcrest administrator's have indicated that this would likely occur only a few times out of the year. As such, the occasional use of the field as a parking area would not be detrimental with regard to oils and soil compaction.

COMMENT 11.12

8. It is not possible to limit the size of the school---gradually, if successful, it will grow. Just as it has in the past. No one in my area was contacted for the last expansion-nor have we been now. We are the homes who are impacted by traffic, four blocks away. Why haven't we been consulted? The only way we even knew about this proposed expansion was due to an adjacent neighbor to the school, who passed out the city's EIR letter to the neighborhood. When the developer of the new houses on the

West side of Shoshone at Mayerling wanted to develop the parcel--- large Notices were posted on the property fences with information about the proposal. Nothing like that has been done in this case. This proposal REQUIRES virtually obliterating a wide variety of zoning laws.—which laws were designed to protect surrounding properties. WHY HASN'T THE CITY REQUIRED HILLCREST TO NOTIFY THE NEIGHBORS? In the Alternative, if Hillcrest was required to notify the neighbors at some point—why hasn't the City discovered that no such notice was given.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.12

Proper notification of the project and environmental review process (i.e., Notice of Preparation and Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR) was provided in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines. In fact, the commentator was provided due notice of the project via the NOP back in 1999 when the preparation of the Draft EIR commenced. . A copy of this letter was included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The availability of the Draft EIR was provided on the City's internet site, mailed to the residents and homeowners within 500 feet radius of the proposed project, published in the Los Angeles Times, and posted on site. All procedural requirements of CEQA have been met.

COMMENT 11.13

9. What does the school plan to do about Students crossing the street to go from one building to the other? This will be necessary—even for the elementary students to get to the gym. These five schools have already forced a traffic light at Rinaldi and Shoshone---what else will have to be done in the future to protect children who will have to cross Shoshone twice a day? Who is protecting the children who live on the residential streets carrying all of these cars? Nugent has already suffered the impact of heavy traffic—Do Not Make it Worse!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.13

Elementary students will not be required to cross Shoshone Avenue as part of their daily routine. Both campuses are designed to be self sufficient and will not require the use of the other campus for daily operations. Under the proposed expansion plan, each campus will be self sufficient, eliminating the need for students to cross through both campuses on a daily basis. Both campuses would be served by their own cafeteria, play area, gymnasium, library, and administrative offices. While some special events may involve students from one campus visiting the opposite campus, that would not be a part of normal day to day operations. Such occurrences would be limited to special assemblies and similar events held in the auditorium. 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 11.14

10. No one can replace mature trees-even the planting of hundreds of new ones leaves a 30 year or more gap-increasing pollution and decreasing noise protection, beauty and the residential nature of the neighborhood. None of the Oaks or Date Palms should be cut-just moved (at most).

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.14

Transplant efforts for oak trees, date palms, and other quality specimen trees on the project site will be decided by the Decision-Maker with advice from the landscape architect. It is the intent of the applicant to develop the West Campus in a manner that is aesthetically pleasing. The landscape design is an important aspect in site development and will be reviewed by City staff as part of the final approvals. Both the applicant and the landscape architect have identified a number of trees on the site, including the referenced date palms, that warrant transplant efforts. All measures will be taken to successfully transplant healthy specimen trees during the construction process.

COMMENT 11.15

11. The City imposed so many restrictions on the new Mosque in Granada Hills, on Encino next to the 118 freeway that it seemed overbearing at least, including not even permitting a Muezzin and requiring Spanish Styling. What is going on here? That is a church-this no longer is one. The Mosque can't even be seen from City streets-yet had to be "Spanish" Style. Hillcrest is right out "in your face" along both Rinaldi and Shoshone- yet is a nondescript plain stucco box without ornamentation and outside the specific plan requirements. Why the selective enforcement of the law? The Mosque even had to limit the size of the building in order to comply with parking requirements. How is Hillcrest School entitled to a different set of rules? If I were on the governing board of the Mosque, I would seriously consider a discrimination suit-if Hillcrest is permitted to proceed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.15

As part of the project approval process, the site plan design, grading plans, architectural plans, and landscape designs will need to be submitted to the City of Los Angeles Planning staff for review and approval. Such plans are reviewed on a project-by-project basis to ensure consistency and compatibility with the existing built environment and applicable regulatory policies and guidelines established in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Planning and Zoning Code, General Plan and associated Community Plans. A review of the conceptual project site plan designs and architectural features is included in Section IV.A, Aesthetics and IV.G, Land Use of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 11.16

12. Existing zoning in this neighborhood is Residential Minimum, Very low I and II, with required horse trails along Mayerling-only one block north of the school. The general plan adopted by the City Council would never permit this intense a use as is proposed for Hillcrest. . The Slope density requirements should also apply Virtually all but about one acre of the proposed new addition to the school is on slopes, some quite steep. In addition, page 3-21 of the General Plan Framework specifically provides

“Infill development shall be designed and sited to maintain the salient characteristics of the neighborhood in which it is located (e.g. Setbacks, building mass, etc.) (Emphasis Added.)”

The present, existing uses range from A-1 to RE11, according to the Granada Hills-Knollwood Specific Plan.

Thus, this proposal directly contradicts existing uses as approved-it also directly contradicts the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan Framework the Specific Plan. This proposal violates setback requirements, building mass considerations, has statutorily inadequate grounds for a public school, damages the environment of Granada Hills, and seeks to impose all of the costs of such over development on the neighborhood. It is not possible to take steps to ameliorate these problems. The traffic will get worse. Already cars drive on Nugent at 40 to 50 miles per hour. The existing building ignores the specific plan—and there is simply not enough room on the proposed new parcel to build a building that is large enough for use, and which meets setback, building mass, and design characteristics required by the specific plan.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.16

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 project is consistent with the underlying zoning district. All variances that may be required to develop the project, including but not limited to the height of retaining walls, reduced yard setbacks and reduced parking, are identified and disclosed in the Draft EIR. Such variances will be reviewed by the Decision-Maker who will evaluate the proposed development with regard to the project’s compatibility with the existing physical environment and surrounding area. As discussed throughout the Draft EIR, the proposed structure will be set back from the property line 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. The proposed Site Plan and Floor Plan diagrams are provided in Section III, Project Description. In addition, it should be noted that The

Planning and Zoning Code establishes the maximum FAR for properties in the A1-1 zone at 3:1. The proposed 75,000 square foot education building will have a FAR of approximately 0.44, and consistent with the Planning and Zoning Code.

COMMENT 11.17

12. This is an earthquake area. Since Hillcrest is at the bottom of the Hill, the soil is primarily alluvial in nature, subject to liquefaction. While a house might expect some damage-a heavier building would be subject to much more serious harm.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.17

The geotechnical feasibility of developing on the proposed project site was evaluated in a geotechnical investigation prepared by GeoSystems Inc. This report formed the basis of the analysis presented in the Draft EIR and was incorporated in its entirety as Appendix D of the Draft EIR. The geotechnical investigation concluded that the project site was stable and suitable for the proposed development, provided the specific recommendations were followed though during project construction. Adherence to these recommendations as well as all applicable building codes and regulations mandated by law, would ensure that impacts associated with geotechnical hazards are reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 11.18

13. “School Site Analysis and Development” (1966)(Amended 1987), California Department of Education. sets standards for school sites throughout the State of California pursuant to California Code of Regulations §14010.

Hillcrest’s current enrollment is 800 students, according to the EIR Notice. According to School Site Analysis and Development- the minimum acreage required is 10.9 acres if there are 300 in grades 1-3, 300 grades 4-6, 100 kindergartners and 300 in grades 7-8.

If the 800 students include all grades K-12 the minimum acreage for grade 9-12 alone, assuming less than 400 students in those grades, is 17.3 acres.

This total proposal will only result in 9 1/2 acres-split by a very high traffic street due to all of the existing schools in the neighborhood. If built as planned-the school will have only one third of the ground space required, one half of the parking- and it is obvious that future expansions will be needed if the school remains so successful at attracting students.

California Code of Regulations 14010 sets standards which are of minimum nature. This proposal is not even remotely close.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.18

The document “School Site Analysis and Development” (1966)(Amended 1987), California Department of Education sets standards for *public* school sites throughout the State of California. These standards do not apply to private schools, as private schools are not funded by public taxes or government funding.

COMMENT 11.19

Thus, this proposal has a profound negative impact on the environment:

- 1.) Increased traffic on already overburdened residential streets.
- 2.) Parking on residential streets.
- 3.) Nighttime activities adjacent to homes.
- 4.) Increased crime from out of area visitors.
- 5.) Noise.
- 6.) Light at night.
- 7.) Loss of mature trees.
- 8.) Violations of general plan.
- 9.) Violations of specific plan.
- 10.) Violations of State School Standards.
- 11.) Destruction of historic homes.
- 12.) Degradation of the residential minimum density environment.
14. There simply is not enough room for what applicants want to do. Applicants have a much larger parcel in Porter Ranch on Rinaldi, that has none of the problems associated with the location. They should build there-and not be permitted to overtax this neighborhood.

Very truly yours,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 11.19

All of the issues raised in this comment have been addressed in the responses provided above. See Response to Comments 11.2 through 11.18.

COMMENT LETTER No. 12

Anonymous

No Date

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr.: Liao,

COMMENT 12.1

As a neighbor of Hillcrest Christian School I would like to express my opposition to the expansion project # CPC 200 1-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi St. in Granada Hills.

I believe the EIR findings prove that the proposed project is too large for the area defined. The traffic alone would be inhibiting with the new residential project in the area using the same 2 lane Shoshone Ave. as an exit to Rinaldi St. It is already a heavily traveled thoroughfare each morning with 2 schools located farther north up Shoshone.

Please take the time to review the findings closely and consider all the factors involved in the traffic findings. If nothing else, the conditions should include the widening of Shoshone St. to accommodate the increase in cars.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 12.1

This comment will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for their consideration. No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines. Traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT LETTER No. 13

Wilhelmina K. Ackart
11020 Belmar Avenue
Northridge, CA 91326
August 1, 2001

Re: Hillcrest Christian School
17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344-3399
Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 13.1

This letter is written to urge the City of Los Angeles to approve the expansion project of a secondary campus for Hillcrest Christian School (Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU).

I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinion on the effect of such secondary campus. As the San Fernando Valley grows, so does its need for more schools. Hillcrest Christian School has a superb reputation for providing excellent education to our youths. Hillcrest also has a superior track record in working and solving problems in our neighborhood. Allowing Hillcrest to expand its campus helps our community to provide excellent education without adding more strain to our overcrowded public schools. The northern end of the San Fernando Valley would only inure to the benefit of a secondary campus. Since my daughter is now entering high school, we definitely have a great need and interest to participate in Hillcrest's expansion project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 13.1

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. 14

Shin Young Ahn
13174 Constable Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
No Date

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 14.1

I am a parent of a student attending Hillcrest Christian School, I want to express my support for the project #CPC 2001-2608 CU. I think that if the school got bigger in size, the students will be able to get around better and not have such a big deal going to class to class in a big crowd. Hillcrest Christian School is growing tremendously due to its good value educational system.

Please reconsider this request for expansion of Hillcrest Christian School.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 14.1

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. 15

Ralph and Debbie Ashley
16463 Gledhill Street
North Hills, CA 91343
July 28, 2001

RE Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 15.1

This letter is written to express our support of Hillcrest Christian School. Our middle school son has enjoyed attending Hillcrest since Kindergarten and because of his wonderful educational experience he is an asset to our community and will continue to be so as he continues his education at Hillcrest.

We have lived in the San Fernando Valley all our lives. Our growing community desperately needs the quality educational opportunities available at Hillcrest Christian. The expansion project at Hillcrest will

support this important need.

Your consideration in moving this project forward is greatly appreciated.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 15.1

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. 16

Brian Baima
Brothers Printing and Lithography
8620 Tamarack Ave.
Sun Valley, CA 91352
Received August 3, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 16.1

My daughter Brittany, has been at Hillcrest Christian School for two years. Next year she will be starting high school at Hillcrest. Hillcrest is an exciting and *quality* learning experience. Brittany has grown in many ways at Hillcrest. Her maturation process at Hillcrest is an extension of our home. We are so looking forward to her continuing education at Hillcrest High School. Please consider our support for the expansion of Hillcrest Christian School.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 16.1

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. 17

Harold and Phyllis Bass
11922 Dunncliffe Court
Northridge, CA 91326-1324
July 20, 2001

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

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 17.1

As we did last year, we are again writing to express our opposition to the proposed -expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We are 16-year residents of the community, who frequent Rinaldi St. on a daily basis to travel to and from work, as well as for other purposes.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 17.1

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 17.2

The area around Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue in this otherwise bucolic residential community is already saturated with eight schools and four religious institutions. Traffic congestion on Rinaldi, Shoshone, and nearby streets for much of the day and on Sunday morning has reached intolerable levels, posing a danger to motorists and pedestrians alike. Children and elderly persons are especially vulnerable. If you had undertaken a traffic study, we're sure you would agree with our observations. Moreover, in your notice of June 21, 2001, you mention 11 anticipated significant effects on the environment. The draft EIR, as submitted, does precious little to mitigate these effects.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 17.2

This comment asserts that the Draft EIR does little to mitigate the effects of the project, but does not provide any specific challenge to the EIR. A Traffic Study was conducted for the proposed project and was included in its entirety in Appendix H to the Draft EIR. This study was summarized and presented in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 17.3

Let's not destroy another neighborhood and additional open space. We urge the City of Los Angeles to **deny** the Hillcrest Christian School 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 City and 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.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 17.3

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. 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. 18

Julianne Beaupre and Carl Scruton
17615 Bryan Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 9, 2001

Reference: **99-0421 cu-zv-zaa**

Dear Jimmy,

COMMENT 18.1

My husband, Carl Scrutoni and I are very much opposed to the expansion of Hill Crest [sic] School at 17531 Rinaldi Street in Granada Hills.

We live just off Louise Avenue and each morning and afternoon there is so much traffic and congestion on Rinaldi, Louise, Shoshone and Nugent avenues that it has been very dangerous for the school children attending in the area.

We are also very distressed that this school would like to tear down historical homes just to expand their school. Additionally, Granada Hills High School is just around the corner and we see no need to add another high school to this area.

We thank you, in advance to represent the citizen's wishes of this neighborhood and DO NOT allow Hill Crest School to expand.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 18.1

The high school is an existing use on the Hillcrest Christian School's East Campus property. The project proposes to expand the existing campus to provide two separate campuses; one for the elementary grade levels and another to serve the middle and high school grade levels. The project will increase the current enrollment capacity from 800 to 1,200 students. Therefore, the project does not propose to introduce a new high school use to the area. The project's traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. The project's impacts upon historic resources are discussed in Section IV.E, Historic Resources.

COMMENT LETTER No. 19

Dr. & Mrs. Kevin Belsby
9950 Balboa Blvd.
Northridge, CA 91325
Received August 8, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 19.1

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

As this community and area continues to grow we are in need of more school space and options Hillcrest has been a very positive experience for our children, however the school is in need of expansion. This school is a great asset to the community and has always communicated to us, the parents, the importance of working with the neighborhood and city in all ways possible. I believe this expansion would be a positive move for the community. I do not believe that any possible concerns regarding traffic or any other perceived problems that may occur should overshadow the positive impact this school has.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 19.1

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. 20

Marilyn Belt
10000 Forbes Ave.
North Hills, CA 91343
No Date

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 20.1

I am taking this opportunity to express my support for the proposed project #CPC 200 1-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344. Not only am I a parent of a student of Hillcrest Christian School, I'm a Granada Hills native and have watched the huge population growth over the years. I personally experienced the overcrowding of the public school system as a child. This area needs quality educational facilities besides the public school system. Hillcrest can assist in meeting this important need.

The draft EIR is completed Hillcrest has established itself as a good neighbor, always working to improve the community. Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

The school is well managed and will continue to be an asset to the community.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 20.1

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. 21

David and Lisa Benson
6714 Cowgirl Court
Simi Valley, CA 93063
July 26, 2001

Re: Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 21.1

My husband and I have three children that attend Hillcrest Christian School, on Rinaldi Street, in Granada Hills, California. Our oldest child has attended Hillcrest since kindergarten, and is about to enter high school. We are very familiar with the school, the staff, the students, and the changes over the last nine years. After growing up in the Granada Hills area, it is clear the area of the north San Fernando Valley that Hillcrest is located in has been, and continues to grow, adding many new families to this area, an area that very much needs additional secondary educational facilities. As one who has been dropping off/picking up children at Hillcrest for many years, as well as attending numerous additional before and after school activities, we are well aware of the care and planning the Hillcrest staff has taken to be considerate of those in the surrounding community, to minimize neighborhood disruptions, and direct the traffic flow. In all of this, the safety of the students has always been extremely important.

In addition, as a real estate appraiser, I have reviewed many EIR's, and the responses of those concerned or supporting a particular project. I know this is an important phase for Hillcrest's expansion plans, and we wanted to make clear that we are avid supporters of the development project referenced above. This area desperately needs more quality education in the north Valley. Hillcrest has been, and will continue to be, a very positive influence for this community, in large part because of the outstanding students that attend the school.

Please give careful consideration to this expansion issue, and recognize the many favorable contributions a secondary campus in Granada Hills can offer. We'd like all three of our children to complete their elementary and secondary education at Hillcrest Christian School, and you can make that happen.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 21.1

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. 22

Nancy Bissonette-Andrew
11828 Preston Trails Ave.
Porter Ranch, CA 91326
August 1, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 22.1

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

Now that the draft EIR is completed, I believe that this project must move forward to fill the need for quality education in the northwestern end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has an outstanding reputation in the community. In addition, the traffic mitigation recommended with this project will also improve the flow of traffic at the existing campus during peak traffic hours.

As the population in this end of the valley continues to grow, Hillcrest Christian School will be better able to meet the need for the provision of quality education for this community's children.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 22.1

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. 23

Michael Blazey
12118 Stewarton Drive
Porter Ranch, CA 91326-1125
July 27, 2001

Re: Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 23.1

My son Todd has been attending Hillcrest Christian School for the past five years and I would like to express to you my full support for the above referenced project at 17531 Rinaldi Street in Granada Hills, California 91344.

Not only as a parent but as a life long member of the community, I feel that Hillcrest Christian School has been an outstanding member of our community, hosting many LAPD events as well as serving as a solid source of outstanding education in a city that is sorely lacking in schools of their caliber.

With the draft Environmental Impact report completed, I believe that this project needs to move forward as soon as possible so that Hillcrest can continue to serve the need for quality education in the North Valley. Hillcrest has continually worked with the neighbors in solving the problems as they arise and the traffic mitigation that was recommended will greatly improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during the peak travel times.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 23.1

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. 24

Lynn and Kathlyne Boeding
27619 Sycamore Creek Drive
Valencia, CA 91354
Received August 3, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 24.1

As the parents of two students at Hillcrest Christian School, we would like to express our support of the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

Now that all the required studies, reports, and forms have been completed and filed, we would like to see the project proceed. Hillcrest Christian School fulfills an important role in providing a quality education to students in the San Fernando Valley. Additionally, Hillcrest has established itself as a good neighbor, working diligently with the surrounding neighborhoods to solve problems that have and may arise.

As the population of this part of the valley continues to grow it is essential that projects such as Hillcrest's be allowed to proceed so that more students are able to attend such a fine school and receive the kind of quality education necessary for success in the 21st (sic) century.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 24.1

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. 25

Lynn M. Bowker
10108 Roscoe Blvd.
Sun Valley, CA 91352
July 29, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 25.1

I would like to express my support for the proposed building project as referenced above for Hillcrest Christian School located at 17531 Rinaldi Street in Granada Hills, California.

Hillcrest has worked diligently during the draft EIR phase to resolve various issues raised by the community. One of the major concerns has been increased traffic flow and by expanding the campus and building more throughways the traffic flow will actually be better than it is presently.

As you know, education of our children is our future. As the population of the north San Fernando Valley and the Santa Clarita Valley continues to grow so does the need for schools. Hillcrest has already established itself over the past 25 years as a fine institution and is ready to meet the challenge of growth in order to provide a quality education to even more young people.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 25.1

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. 26

Marianne Bradford
11747 Andasol Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 26, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 26.1

As a former parent and neighbor of Hillcrest Christian School, I strongly feel that I need to personally express my support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344

The need for a quality education for student's in grades kindergarten through twelfth is in great demand in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest Christian School has established itself as a superior educational facility and has a reputation of being cooperative and friendly when working with the community to solve problems as they might arise. From personal experience, I can attest to the fact that Superintendent David Kendrick is always willing to discuss any issues with concerned parties and seek agreeable resolutions.

The population in our community increases every year, as does the need for student school placement. Hillcrest Christian School will assist in meeting this important need.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 26.1

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. 27

Michelle and Reid Brekke
18867 Kinbrace Street
Northridge, CA 91326-1030
August 2, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 27.1

We are parents of a child at Hillcrest Christian School. We are writing to tell you of our support of the proposed project CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

The north end of the San Fernando Valley is growing, especially to the west of Hillcrest Christian School. I (Michelle) am a public school teacher and we both believe in our public school system. Yet we feel that our child should learn to live by the laws and tenants of the Bible both at home and in their daily school environment. Hillcrest Christian School offers this to our child and we would like to see this opportunity offered to others. A quality school such as Hillcrest could be beneficial to all.

Hillcrest School has been a good neighbor and a positive influence within the neighborhood. We would like to see these expansion/improvements that are suggested be approved by your offices. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 27.1

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. 28

Larry K. Brown
3552 Greenville Avenue
Simi Valley, CA 93063
July 29, 2001

Dear. Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 28.1

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

I believe the project should move ahead as the Environmental Impact Report draft has been completed. The proposed project will fill a much needed quality education in the north end of the Valley. The completion of this project will help alleviate any problems that may currently exist with the present school configuration. Hillcrest Christian has been a valuable asset to the community in that they have worked hard with the neighbors in solving any problem that may have arisen. The quality of education is very good and this project will assure that they will be able to handle any increase in student population that may occur.

The students who attend the school are respectful of the surrounding property and this speaks volumes of how the school is viewed in the community. The growth in the area is continuing and the school will be able to provide an excellent alternative to those parents who so desire with this project.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 28.1

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).