

COMMENT LETTER No. 47

Laura and Rocco Fasone
17811 Mayerling Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 8, 2001

COMMENT 47.1

This letter is to seriously protest the proposed project. I live on the adjacent street to the proposed site. I have listed a number of reasons why this project should be denied or minimized.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 47.1

The commentator's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration.

COMMENT 47.2

1. Although this is a strictly residential —if you live and travel at certain times of the day: a) commuting time, b) end of school day c) end of Church service, d) and on special nightly events, Shoshone and gets backed up and sometimes there is a long line to the signal at Rinaldi.
2. Personally, I moved from a very lovely area (Sherman Oaks) because the over development of the residential area and school sites- the traffic at times is just horrible. I have now lived in my current home for three years and in utter fear that I will have to deal with problem again.
3. No residential area should have to deal with this amount of traffic and the proposed site will only make it worse.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 47.2

These comments are noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As stated in the Draft EIR, all of the significant traffic impacts can be mitigated to levels that are less than significant with implementation of the required mitigation measures identified therein.

COMMENT 47.3

4. The one beautiful thing about Granada Hills is the natural and historic scenery; this includes the vegetation and trees. I think it is sick that you would consider cutting down beautiful mature trees that have been there for decades. I also understand that this site would also destroy historical buildings. To do this so that a “Private” school can increase their enrollment to make more money is unthinkable.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 47.3

Impacts associated with trees and historic resources are discussed in Section IV.C and IV.E of the Draft EIR, respectively. As discussed in Section IV.E. Historic Resources of the Draft EIR, the residences at 11515 Shoshone Avenue and 11525 Shoshone Avenue are not considered historic resources as 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. With regard to the relocation of this structure, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 3 on page 28.

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

COMMENT 47.4

5. Five feet parking setbacks- in a residential area? Come on! This is not a commercial area. Remember that this is still an equestrian area where people choose to live so-they can ride their horses in peace and safety!!!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 47.4

As discussed in the Draft EIR, the applicant will need to obtain a variance from the City of Los Angeles zoning administrator to build within 5-foot of Rinaldi Street. The variance is requested to construct a parking lot and two-to-three foot parking wall to shield light and glare onto adjacent residential houses. The actual education building will be set back from Rinaldi Street by over 25 feet at it’s nearest point. The parking area and parking lot wall will be heavily landscaped and well kept to ensure the campus maintains an aesthetically pleasing visual presence, with respect to the neighboring residential properties. In addition, the parking lot will be landscaped in accordance with street trees in accordance with the City’s Landscape Ordinance. See Section IV.A, Aesthetics and Section IV.C, Biological Resources.

The project site is zoned A1-1-K indicating it is in an equine keeping district. However, the zoning of

the property indicates allowable uses, not required uses. The project site is not located contiguous to any other equine zoned properties and no horses are kept on the project site. Moreover all of the immediately surrounding properties are zoned residential (RA-1), agricultural (A-1), and public facilities (PF-1) and are not associated with horse-related uses. Therefore, the use of the site as a school campus will not effect any properties with respect to keeping horses.

COMMENT 47.5

6. Hillcrest has an alternative with a zero impact. Why should they be allowed to Proceed with that plan instead of destroying our area.
7. When has any other business (Private School) ever been allowed to get away with only 52% of the required parking?
8. A playing field the size of a football field — with PA system and lights? Would you want to live in this area? No- but you won't help us to stop this development.
9. Existing zoning in this neighborhood is residential minimum- with required horse trails along Mayerling — only one block north of the school. The general plan originally adopted by the City Council would never permit this intense use.

I could go on and on forever about reasons why this proposal is not practical, ethical and right. But, maybe it's all about money and no matter how much we protest — it doesn't matter. Please support our right to live in a normal residential area.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 47.5

The commentator's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. It should be noted that the proposed project does not include any lights for the proposed athletic field. Minimal security lighting may be positioned around the campus, in consultation with the LAPD. However, no lighting is proposed to support outdoor athletic events after daylight hours. The previous proposal to include nighttime lighting for the athletic field was eliminated from the current application materials.

With regard to item No 7, above, 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.

With regard to item No. 9, above, 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. The Agricultural (A1) zone permits conditional uses, as enumerated in Section 12.24 of the Planning and Zoning Code.

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 LETTER No. 48

Craig and Donna Felten
17561 Regency Way
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 3, 2001

RE: Draft EIR NO. 99-042 1-CU-ZV-ZAA

Dear Mr. Liao;

COMMENT 48.1

This letter is to inform you of our opposition to the expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We have been Granada Hills residents since 1988 and live 3½ blocks north of Hillcrest Christian School. We relocated to this area because of Its quiet serenity, beauty and the quality of living it affords. Since moving to our current home, there has been tremendous development in the area that has Impacted that quality of life. We feel the expansion of Hillcrest Christian School will cause further problems regarding the aesthetics of our area. We also anticipate there will be very noticeable negative impact regarding air quality, public services, street congestion. vandalism and noise. Our reasons are as follows:

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.1

The commentator's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration.

COMMENT 48.2

- There is an abundance of schools, churches and day-care facilities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed expansion. They are; Hillcrest Christian School (which rents its chapel to a Korean congregation on weekends), Rinaldi Adult School (which has day and evening classes), St. Euphrasia School, St. Euphrasia Church, Robert Frost Junior High School, KinderCare, Home-Based Children's Day Care, Islamic Center of Northridge and Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Much of the traffic for the above-mentioned facilities flows south on Nugent and Shoshone, converging at Rinaldi, A portion of Shoshone just south of the Nugent/Shoshone

intersection is barely wide enough for two-way traffic and is somewhat dangerous in light traffic conditions. Several yards south of this portion of the road there are no sidewalks for pedestrian traffic. This means that children walking to and from school must walk in the street or on private lawns. Some of these lawns are not accessible to foot traffic because of landscaping, thus the children are forced to walk in traffic. I have seen elementary school-aged children loaded down with backpacks and lunch boxes walking between parked cars and moving vehicles in order to get to school in the morning. Does anyone else think this is dangerous?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.2

The project proposes to widen Shoshone to allow an unrestricted right turn lane. A graphic of this roadway re-configuration is provided in Figure IV.J.1-11 on page 231 of the Draft EIR. As shown on the proposed roadway improvement, an 8 to 10 foot wide sidewalk is proposed for the west side of Shoshone. A sidewalk currently exists on the east side of Shoshone adjacent to the East Campus. Rinaldi Street includes a sidewalk fronting the West and East Campuses east and west of Shoshone Avenue. Area sidewalks beyond the school's property lines are outside the scope or purview of this project.

COMMENT 48.3

- Adding a high school to accommodate 400 additional students and 60 staff members will completely gridlock the area. Additionally, many of the added commuters will be *new, teenage drivers*. How scary is that?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.3

The traffic impacts of the proposed project are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. All area intersections analyzed as part of this study will operate at a level that is below significance criteria of the LADOT after implementation of the required mitigation measures. In addition, as a mitigation measure to reduce parking impacts, Hillcrest will be required to implement a parking pass program for student drivers. This mitigation measure will limit the amount of student drivers that are allowed to drive to school to 60 students.

COMMENT 48.4

- The Hillcrest project provides for a total of 124 parking spaces in lieu of the 286 spaces required by code. Is this really enough parking for students and staff in a high school this size? Overflow parking will need to be handled by our already busy and overused streets. What if another school or church is having a function at the same time? What about the people/cars attending athletic events held on the proposed athletic field? There literally will be no place to park, never mind the gridlock that will result from the increased amount of traffic on our streets!
- We do not believe that the traffic/parking problems caused by the athletic field will happen only occasionally. Hillcrest has a track record of renting their facilities. So even if Hillcrest does not have their facilities scheduled for their own use, they will certainly be generating revenues by renting their facilities to other organizations. The Hillcrest facility will be in use much of the time.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.4

Parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the project parking analysis, the proposed overflow parking area is identified on the northern play area of the East Campus, not the proposed athletic field on the West Campus. Also, it should be noted that the use of this field will be infrequent, as special event functions are only planned for a handful of days of every school year. With the use of this parking area, up to 402 spaces will be provided, thus eliminating the need for Hillcrest drivers to park off-site on neighboring streets. Parking availability for more regular scheduled events, such as events in the chapel or gymnasium events when attendance is not as high, is expected to be adequately provided on site between the East and West Campus parking lots combined.

COMMENT 48.5

- Hillcrest has proposed that they will abate some of the Rinaldi traffic/carpool congestion by using Shoshone. Shoshone Is already overcrowded. It cannot assume even the slightest increase in traffic. Additionally, the Hillcrest carpool guidelines are already ignored by many of the people who use it. Some of the Hillcrest carpool drivers park in an unsafe manner on Rinaldi. They pull out into traffic in an unsafe manner. They make unsafe U-turns. They ignore traffic signals. Hillcrest might think that passing out informational leaflets at the beginning of the school year will discourage some of this behavior. I say this is a weak remedy to a serious problem.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.5

The traffic impacts of the proposed project are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. With the proposed traffic improvements to Shoshone Avenue (i.e., unrestricted right turn lane), and the required mitigation measures listed on pages 229 and 230 of the Draft EIR, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

COMMENT 48.6

- Hopefully, the timing of a traffic study was considered during the preparation of this draft EIR in order to get a fair representation of the street use; that is, when schools/churches in the area were in session.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.6

The traffic counts used to form the baseline traffic conditions for the project traffic study were conducted when Hillcrest school and other area schools were in session.

COMMENT 48.7

- The geologic map of the Oat Mountain and Canoga Park quadrangles (Thomas Dibblee, 1992) shows an earthquake fault line running along Ridgeway at Shoshone (The Mission Hills Fault). This is a fact of life in California, but do we really want to build another school in an area of potential disaster?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.7

The West Campus property has undergone an extensive geotechnical feasibility investigation by GeoSoils Inc. The results of their investigation is included in Section IV.D. Geotechnical Hazards of the EIR. As documented on page 125 of the Draft EIR, no evidence of active faulting was observed during field exploration. The Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation concluded that an active trace or potentially active strand of the Mission Hills fault, or any other fault, does not lie between the site's southern property line and 50-feet north of the proposed building limits. As such, no setback restriction zones with regard to active faults are applicable to the proposed project site.

COMMENT 48.8

- Rinaldi is a designated alternate freeway in the event the 188 freeway is blocked or detoured. Can Rinaldi adequately provide evacuation of this entire area in the event of an emergency?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.8

As discussed above in Response to Comment 48.5, with implementation of the proposed roadway improvements along Shoshone Avenue and the required traffic mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Based on this analysis, Rinaldi Street will be able to function as an alternate route 118 in the event of an emergency.

COMMENT 48.9

- It may seem inconsequential to some, but the loss of many of the old, large trees on this property will negatively impact the quality of our neighborhood.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.9

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Impacts to biological resources, including the loss of oak trees and non-oak trees, are addressed in Section IV.C of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 48.10

- Hillcrest Christian School has a record of returning to the Zoning Board for variances in order to increase its student enrollment. These include from 1964 (church only for 250 people, Zoning Permit No. 7417065) to 1976 (parochial school, kindergarten to sixth grade, with additional structures, 800 students, zoning permit No. ZA96-005 {CUZ} {ZV}) with other variances in between these as noted. The current project previously proposed an outdoor play field. This is now being called an athletic field. It will be a full-out sports stadium in no time.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.10

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.

COMMENT 48.11

We do not oppose the growth of Hillcrest Christian School; however, expansion at the proposed location would have an extremely negative impact on the existing neighborhoods and surrounding streets. Hillcrest has a track record of following the theory of, "If you give them an inch, they'll take a

foot.” A request for approval of 1,200 students will lead to 1,600+ . A request for a play area will lead to a full-out football stadium. How else can they justify the over \$2 million they have spent for development so far? We need to curtail development of this area, not continue to allow it to exceed limits established by current zoning regulations.

To be most consistent with the goals of the community of Granada Hills, the best use for the proposed site is for residential, low-density development.

Please DENY a Conditional Use Permit, Parking Variance, Zoning Administration Adjustment and Oak Tree Permit to Hillcrest Christian School Please place this letter of objection re the above-mentioned Draft EIR 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 mater.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 48.11

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. As stated above, 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 LETTER No. 49

Ginger Fong
17442 Rushing Drive
Granada Hills, CA 91344-1911
August 6, 2001

Re: Support to build on the adjacent property

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 49.1

Thank-you for recieving (sic) my call regarding the anticipated projects to build in the corner of Shoshone and Rinaldi. I appreciate the time you took to explain to me what is being proposed by Hillcrest on the blue prints.

I am fully aware of the opposition by some neighbors for Hillcrest to expand to add on a three story building, parking, and a play area. I am in full support for this school to continue their plan to build for the following reasons.

1. This school has been in the Granada Hills area longer than most of the new home tracts and had a vision to expand before the area became in demand for housing.
2. The corner of Shoshone and Rinaldi will be aesthetically improved by the new building, landscape and play area
3. The school has been part of the community for many years and has become a landmark in the continuing positive change in Granada Hills.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 49.1

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 49.2

Although I am in support of the expansion of the school, I do have some concerns of the traffic jam that it will cause. I was made aware of the widening of Shoshone, 14' wider for 250' which needs to direct the flow of traffic to the school and onto Rinaldi.

But, Rinaldi must have a lane added to accommodate the flow of traffic into the parking lot, separate from the right hand turn on to Rinaldi.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 49.2

This request is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Currently, there are no proposals to widen Rinaldi Street to make an additional turn lane. However, Rinaldi Street is designated as Major Highway Class II in the Streets and Highways Element of the City's General Plan. Rinaldi Street is currently 40-foot half roadway on a 50-foot half right-of-way. Standard Plan S-470-0, effective November 10, 1999, dictates that the standard cross section for a Major Highway Class II is 40-foot half roadway on a 52-foot half right-of-way. A 2-foot dedication along the project frontage will be required on Rinaldi Street to meet the standards required by the General Plan. The Bureau of Engineering, Department of Public Works, will determine the exact dedication and widening requirements for this project.

Furthermore, as amended in the Corrections and Additions Section of this Final EIR, a 2-foot wide strip of land will be dedicated along Rinaldi Street adjoining the proposed west campus property in accordance with Major Highway-Class II Standards, including a 20-foot radius property line return at the intersection with Shoshone Avenue. In addition to the Shoshone Avenue street improvement mitigation measure as shown on figure IV.J.1-11 of the DEIR, a 2-foot street dedication should also be provided northerly of the transition area over the remaining project frontage to provide a 32-foot half street dedication.

COMMENT 49.3

I am particularly concerned for the 286 required parking for Hillcrest to build and the variance that they are asking to ONLY build for 124. With the gymnasium to accommodate (sic) hundreds of people, adequate parking must be made.

I suggest that plans for the area be maximized to have either a two story parking structure, or subterranean (sic) parking. This would offer a Win-Win situation for the neighbors (sic) who are so fearful and angry that the overflow parking would be in front (sic) of their house and street, the requirement is met, and minimizing any court time for Hillcrest to continue fighting the neighbors against the expansion (sic).

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 49.3

The project proposes to provide 124 spaces on the West Campus. Combined with the available parking areas on the East Campus, up to 272 parking spaces will be made available on a daily basis. A parking demand analysis for the proposed project was prepared and presented in Section IV.J.2 of the Draft EIR. As part of this analysis, it was assumed that school administrators would control the amount of high school drivers that would be allowed to drive to school. 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.

The concept of constructing a subterranean parking structure was evaluated by Hillcrest Administrator's and the project Civil Engineer early on in the process. The costs associated with excavating the bedrock formation and constructing a subterranean parking structure on this project site would be infeasible.

COMMENT 49.4

I do support the building of either the tennis courts or a running track, but not an open stadium.

My children attend a private school which runs along a major street like Hillcrest and also is adjacent to

a residential street like Shoshone. There is a larger 'play area' there to accomodate (sic) a running track and field, and this does not interfere with the residents for noise pollution or traffic problems.

Since school is held during the week days, I do not think this will be a problem for the weekends. At all schools, whether private or public, there will always be a traffic problem in a residential area. Unfortunately, this is the reality of a growing, community such as Granada Hills. The often, yet frustrating attitude is, yes, 'Yes it will develop (sic) the area, or there's a need to expand, but, "NOT IN MY BACKYARD'.

I am in FULL support of the expansion of Hillcrest and look forward to the final draft.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 49.4

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

COMMENT LETTER No. 50

Angela D. Fort
20237 Lassen Street
Chatsworth, CA 91311
August 1, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao;

COMMENT 50.1

As a parent of a student attending Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the proposed above-referenced project at 17631 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 has established itself as a good neighbor, working with the community to solve 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 this area of our community continues to grow, it is our desire that Hillcrest Christian School assists in meeting this important need. This school is a great asset to the area, Hillcrest is a great asset to the area not only because of the fine students that attend, but because they truly involve themselves with working with, giving back to, and improving the community.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 50.1

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. 51

Leslie and Mark Friedman
17426 Flanders Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 30, 2001

RE: EIR Case No.: 99-0421(CZ) (ZV) (ZAA)

Project Name: Hillcrest Christian School and Church

17531 Rinaldi Street

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 51.1

As members of the Shoshone Neighborhood Preservation Association and homeowners within 500 feet of Hillcrest Christian School, we oppose their proposed plans for expansion to the northwest corner of Rinaldi and Shoshone. Please include this letter of objection into the official records of the County of Los Angeles and forward copies to all applicable city and county departments. Please notify us of any and all variations and notices regarding the aforementioned.

We strongly believe that the construction of a high school and athletic field in a residential community already saturated with schools, churches and traffic would negatively impact the community in the following ways:

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.1

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 51.2

***The area is zoned for single family residences, not multistory commercial buildings which will bring hundreds of additional vehicle trips into the area on a daily basis.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.2

The zoning and general plan designations and impacts associated with plan consistency and land use compatibility are addressed in Section IV.G of the Draft EIR. The project site is zoned A1-1-K, which permits school uses with a conditional use permit. Therefore, the project is consistent with the underlying zoning of the site. The site is not in a commercial zone or land use designation.

COMMENT 51.3

***The proposed multi-structure campus is not a public school. It is a private commercial enterprise which has the potential to generate noise and traffic late into the night. An athletic field which could include, now or in the future, light towers and public address system is totally unacceptable in a residential neighborhood. The existing campus is regularly used by groups other than the Christian School for religious services, sporting and other events and the proposed campus has the potential similar use by non-school groups seven days a week.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.3

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 or to include stadium lighting that would enable it to function past daylight hours. 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.

The existing operations on the East Campus were discussed in Section III.B, Overview of Environmental Setting. Leased operations for the East Campus were discussed in that section and are not expected to change as part of this project proposal. This project proposal is specifically for the West Campus and does not propose any actions that would alter the daily operations or facilities of the East Campus.

COMMENT 51.4

***The variance requested for parking spaces will result in overflow parking on residential streets and will compromise the safety of the neighborhood. There should be no variance permitted on the required number of parking spaces nor should there be a variance on the setback of the parking lot. The parking lot should be set back the required 25 feet to allow a barrier for the noise, fumes and disruption that will be created from early morning until late at night.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.4

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The reduced setback 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, not for the proposed education building. 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.

COMMENT 51.5

***Parents who transport children to the existing Hillcrest campus consistently ignore safety precautions on Rinaldi. They travel east on Rinaldi and regularly make u-turns to access the school on the North side of the street endangering other motorists and pedestrians. The use Flanders Street as a pass-through and also make u-turns at the Flanders-Andasol intersection without regard to pedestrians or other drivers. Even a gentleman name Mr. Cervantes, a traffic engineer conducting tests for this study, was nearly hit by a careless parent with a van transporting children. It is an extremely dangerous and heavily-traveled area. Hazardous driving practices have been report to Hillcrest staff innumerable times and nothing changes. Relocating the school's exit driveway to correspond with the Encino intersection will not eliminate the hazard created by impatient parents dropping off children or long lines of cars waiting their turn to enter the lot. A western campus will further exacerbate this already untenable public safety hazard. Parents who travel east on Rinaldi will still need to cut across oncoming traffic to access the school's parking. A traffic study over several days should be done (at a time unannounced to the school administration) when school is in session during the regular year—not summer session.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.5

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. The existing turning movements, traffic patterns and behavior by people driving to Hillcrest and the surrounding areas schools was discussed in the Draft EIR on page 204. It should be emphasized that this neighborhood intrusion is a phenomenon associated with the existing traffic and access to the front parking lot for drop-off and pick-up of the current students. The applicant has proposed several roadway reconfigurations and alignments that would improve circulation on adjacent roadways. These improvements will, in turn,

reduce traffic intrusion into adjoining residential neighborhoods. In addition, this situation will not be exacerbated by the West Campus expansion because 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. 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 51.6

***In an emergency, evacuation of the immediate neighborhood and that to the north would be chaotic. Shoshone and Andasol are the area's only ingress and egress. In addition, Rinaldi is the designated alternate route to the 118 freeway and is frequently affected by traffic conditions on the 118. The Porter Ranch expansion has had a noticeable impact on traffic in the last year.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.6

As discussed above in Response to Comment 48.5, with implementation of the proposed roadway improvements along Shoshone Avenue and the required traffic mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Based on this analysis, Rinaldi Street will be able to function as an alternate route 118 in the event of an emergency.

COMMENT 51.7

As you consider the environmental impact of the proposed Hillcrest Christian School expansion, we urge you to take into account the negative aspects which we have outlined above. A private school's desire to increase its size should not take precedence over the safety of a neighborhood and its residents.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 51.7

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

COMMENT LETTER No. 52

Jack and Sandra Gastil
29315 Abelia Road
Canyon Country, CA 91387-2254
No Date

Ref Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 52.1

As a parent of two daughters, and soon to be a third, attending Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to express my total support for the proposed project as stated above for the location listed at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

With the draft EIR completed, my family and I strongly believe the said project must continue forward to fill a must needed quality education in this part of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest, I feel has established itself as a good neighbor. They have worked with the community in addressing any concerns they may have as they arise. Also, I think that the traffic mitigation that has been recommended will greatly improve the traffic flow for the area at the existing school campus during peak travel times.

As the population of this and surrounding areas of our community continues to grow, I believe that Hillcrest Christian School will serve as a great asset in meeting the important needs of schools. This school also has a great asset of children that attend, that, are, and in the future will continue to be model citizens for the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of this project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 52.1

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. 53

Reynaldo and Rhodora Gonzales
16716 Devonshire St., #14
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 30, 2001

Ref: Case # CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 53.1

We are greatly pleased to write this letter of support as parents of Hillcrest Christian School for the proposed expansion project at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344, Case # CPC 2001-2608 CU.

Hillcrest Christian School is known in the San Fernando Valley not only for its high quality education but most especially for the deeply rooted Christian values that it teaches and stands for. We live in Granada Hills near the school and we surely know for a fact that we are in a good neighborhood with fine staff, disciplined students and cooperative parents. With the draft EIR completed, we believe the said project must move forward. Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the campus during peak travel times.

The population in our area continues to grow and it is our desire that Hillcrest Christian School expands to meet this important need. The school is a great asset in the community and it is our number one choice for our child.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 53.1

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. 54

Greenberg & Bass
Harold Greenberg
16000 Ventura Boulevard
Suite 100
Encino, CA 91436-2730
August 15, 2001

Re: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 54.1

My wife and I are parents of a seventh grade student who attends Hillcrest Christian School. 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.

We have been informed that the draft Environmental Impact Report for this project has been completed. As co-counsel for the petitioners who filed a petition on December 9, 1999 to reorganize the Los Angeles Unified School District to form the North and South San Fernando Valley Unified School Districts pursuant to Education Code Section 35100, I am deeply involved in the educational needs of the children of Los Angeles County. I believe that this 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 an institution of quality education, as well as a good neighbor, working with the community to solve and resolve problems as they might arise. In addition, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

The population of the north San Fernando Valley continues to grow. Hillcrest Christian School has and will continue to play an important role and assist in meeting the important educational needs of the community. This school is a valuable asset to the community because of the quality of the education provided to its students and the fine students who attend the school.

Thank you in advance for your courtesy and consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 54.1

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. 55

Lance J. Haliday
10924 Whitaker Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 3, 2001

Re: Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 55.1

I am a Granada Hills' resident with all three of my children enrolled at Hillcrest Christian School; my oldest child is entering the 11th grade and has attended HCS since Kindergarten. I am writing this letter to communicate my support of the school's proposed expansion project, at 17531 Rinaldi St., Granada Hills, CA, 91344 (#CPC 2001-2068 CU).

I know the proposed expansion project has gone through several modifications in response to the input of local residents. The school has carefully considered how to improve traffic flow on Rinaldi Street during peak periods. Much time and resources have been dedicated in the past years to being thorough with the various required reports and studies. The timing now seems right to see the project through to its completion.

The school's main purpose is to educate its students yet I believe that the total impact of the school is much broader than that. I have witnessed the positive influence that Hillcrest Christian School has had on the local community. There have been several positive community outreaches in which I have participated with the school over the years. The school's expansion project will provide us with more opportunities to build upon the positive reputation we have already established. Additionally, the San Fernando Valley will benefit from the school's expansion in that HCS will provide a choice for parents who live in or are recently moving into the rapidly growing area of the northern part of the Valley. I really do see it as a "win-win" situation for the school and for the Valley.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my comments. God bless you!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 55.1

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. 56

Jeffrey and Jane Harrier
17651 Mayerling St.
Granada Hills, Ca 91344
No Date

RE: Project 99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 56.1

We have recently received your letter regarding the project and proposed expansion of Hillcrest School. We are very concerned about the zone variance to allow the reduction in parking and the reduction of the 25-foot setback. This would put a tremendous strain on our neighborhood and its 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 (sic). Shoshone is a very narrow street and would be the main thoroughfare for 3 schools in the area on a daily basis. This is in addition to the thousands of homes that exit north of Rinaldi St., 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 increase in noise, potential danger in an emergency such as fire, flood, or earthquake when thousands are trying to flee the area are reasons to reduce the scope of the Hillcrest 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 56.1

With regard to parking impacts, the project proposes to provide adequate on site parking for daily operational needs and does not propose the use of street parking. As discussed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR, the project is seeking a variance to provide a reduced amount of parking. However, 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.

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, no unavoidable significant impacts are anticipated for any of these environmental issue areas.

COMMENT LETTER No. 57

Jeffrey Harrier
17651 Mayerling St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 1, 2001

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

Dear Mr. Liao;

COMMENT 57.1

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.

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 57.1

A traffic study was conducted for the Draft EIR. Please see Section IV.J.1 Traffic and Appendix H. The project's impacts with regard to each of the eleven environmental issue areas identified previously in the NOP were analyzed in the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures were recommended to reduce the project's impacts for each issue area. Please see the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Section of this Final EIR.

COMMENT 57.2

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 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.

Thanks for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 57.2

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The commentator has been added to the project mailing list and will be notified of future hearings with regard to this project.

COMMENT LETTER No. 58

Jae Hyun Kang
10329 Babbitt Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
No Date

Ref. Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 58.1

As neighbor of Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to add my support to the expansion of Hillcrest School, regarding case number CPC 2001-2608 CU. This is such an asset to the community as it offers quality education in a wholesome environment for our youth. On the heels of the Columbine shooting and other such incidents I believe it is a travesty that the community would even consider not allowing such a fine institution to expand its doors. We need more places where young people can learn in an environment free from fear. It should be our responsibility as a community to help in any way possible. Thus I give my full support to the proposed expansion.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 58.1

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. 59

Judith Kelley
26530 Randi Ct.
Santa Clarita, CA 91321
August 3, 2001

REFERENCE CASE #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 59.1

As a grandparent of one of Hillcrest Christian School students, 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 has established itself as a very good neighbor, working with the community to solve problems as they might 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 the 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 in advance for you (sic) consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 59.1

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. 60.1

Sean and Pam Key
18821 Kirkcolm Ln.
Northridge, CA 91326
July 29, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 60.1

As a Parents (sic) of a child at Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to tell you how much this project (#CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi, Granada Hills, CA 91344) means to our family and our community.

With the draft Environmental Impact Report finished, we think this project should go forward as it will fill a need for quality education in our part of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has always been a good neighbor, and always willing to work with the surrounding community. They have worked to minimize their impact on traffic and will continue to do so.

As you all ready know our part of the San Fernando Valley is growing rapidly and we believe that Hillcrest must be allowed to expand to continue to meet the needs of our community.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this project, as it is so important to our family and our community.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 60.1

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. 61

Jennifer Kim
15714 Horace St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
No Date

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 61.1

I am writing this letter regarding the expansion of Hillcrest Christian School. I am in favor of this expansion, for I believe that the upcoming generation badly needs a place in which strong moral values, and Biblical faith is taught, in conjunction with good, quality education. As a mother and educator, I cannot think of a better school than hillcrest. At Hillcrest Christian School parents drop-off their children with peace of mind, knowing that their children are in a safe, nurturing environment where the children are taught strong moral values. There need for the expansion of the school is evidence that many others in the community feels (sic) the same way.

Thank you for taking the time out to read and consider this letter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO LETTER 61.1

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. 62

Sung Chan Kim
10635 Balcom Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
No Date

Ref. Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 62.1

I would like to express my support for the proposed expansion project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344. As a resident of the surrounding area it is my opinion that an expansion of a school such as Hillcrest, could only be a benefit to the community. I know first-hand that the youth which attend the afore mentioned school, present the type of character and values which richly add to the character of the Granada Hills region. Although I am aware that an expansion of the school may cause a minor inconvenience (sic) to the neighboring residents, the benefits far outweigh them. First, the supposed traffic congestion will be rectified due to the multiple sites at which parents are able to pick up their children, spreading out the congestion over a larger area will only reduce the congestion. Secondly, as the neighborhood continues to grow with young families, the public schools are being overburdened and as we all know under financed, Hillcrest's expansion will only help the community with this distressing predicament.

Thank you for taking this matter into your consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO LETTER 62.1

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).