

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

LEAD CITY AGENCY
City of Los Angeles

COUNCIL DISTRICT
CD 2 - PAUL KREKORIAN

PROJECT TITLE
ENV-2016-1573-MND

CASE NO.
VTT-74064-SL

PROJECT LOCATION
4531 N TUJUNGA AVE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project requests a Tract Map for the subdivision of two parcels into eight small lot parcels, for the demolition of two existing triplexes on site, and for the construction of eight small lot homes on each lot in the RD1.5-1-RIO zone. The property is designated for Low Medium Residential uses by the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan. The net lot area is approximately 12,794 square feet after dedication. The project will provide 16 parking spaces. Vehicular access would be provided via a common access driveway connecting to Tujunga Avenue.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY

Tujunga Village, INC. C/O Apik Minassian
208 East Sixth Street Suite A-11
Los Angeles, CA 90014

FINDING:

The City Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles has Proposed that a mitigated negative declaration be adopted for this project because the mitigation measure(s) outlined on the attached page(s) will reduce any potential significant adverse effects to a level of insignificance

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 2)

SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IMPOSED.

Any written comments received during the public review period are attached together with the response of the Lead City Agency. The project decision-maker may adopt the mitigated negative declaration, amend it, or require preparation of an EIR. Any changes made should be supported by substantial evidence in the record and appropriate findings made.

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.

NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM

TITLE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

LILIAN RUBIO

Planning Assistant

(213) 978-1840

ADDRESS

SIGNATURE (Official)

DATE

200 N. SPRING STREET, 7th FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012



August 22, 2016

I-10. Aesthetics (Landscape Plan)

- Environmental impacts to the character and aesthetics of the neighborhood may result from project implementation. However, the potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measure:
- All landscaped areas shall be maintained in accordance with a landscape plan, including an automatic irrigation plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect in accordance with LAMC Sections 12.40 and 12.41. The final landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning during the building permit process.

IV-70. Tree Removal (Non-Protected Trees)

- Environmental impacts from project implementation may result due to the loss of significant trees on the site. However, the potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the following measures:
- Prior to the issuance of any permit, a plot plan shall be prepared indicating the location, size, type, and general condition of all existing trees on the site and within the adjacent public right(s)-of-way.
- All significant (8-inch or greater trunk diameter, or cumulative trunk diameter if multi-trunked, as measured 54 inches above the ground) non-protected trees on the site proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio with a minimum 24-inch box tree. Net, new trees, located within the parkway of the adjacent public right(s)-of-way, may be counted toward replacement tree requirements.
- Removal or planting of any tree in the public right-of-way requires approval of the Board of Public Works. Contact Urban Forestry Division at: 213-847-3077. All trees in the public right-of-way shall be provided per the current standards of the Urban Forestry Division, Bureau of Street Services, Department of Public Works.

X-60. Land Use/Planning

- The project will result in land use and/or planning impact(s). However, the impact(s) can be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with the following measure(s):
- An air filtration system shall be installed and maintained with filters meeting or exceeding the ASHRAE Standard 52.2 Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 12, to the satisfaction of the Department of Building and Safety.

XII-20. Increased Noise Levels (Demolition, Grading, and Construction Activities)

-
- Construction and demolition shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 6:00 pm on Saturday.
- Demolition and construction activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously, which causes high noise levels.
- The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY
and CHECKLIST
(CEQA Guidelines Section 15063)

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT: CD 2 - PAUL KREKORIAN	DATE:
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning		
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2016-1573-MND	RELATED CASES: VTT-74064-SL	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:	<input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT		
ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project requests a Tract Map for the subdivision of two parcels into eight small lot parcels, for the demolition of two existing triplexes on site, and for the construction of eight small lot homes on each lot in the RD1.5-1-RIO zone. The property is designated for Low Medium Residential uses by the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan. The net lot area is approximately 12,794 square feet after dedication. The project will provide 16 parking spaces. Vehicular access would be provided via a common access driveway connecting to Tujunga Avenue.		
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS: The property consists of two parcels currently improved with two triplexes which are to be demolished. The net lot area is 0.29 (12,794 square feet) after dedication. The property is currently zoned RD1.5-1-RIO and is designated for Low Medium Residential uses by the Sherman Oaks – studio City – Toluca Lake – Cahuenga Pass Community Plan. The property site is not part of a specific plan, however it is located in a Liquefaction Zone. Surrounding properties are within the RD1.5-1-RIO and R1-1-RFA-RIO and are characterized by level topography and substandard and standard lot width. The properties immediately neighboring and north of the site are developed with one-story single-family and multi-family dwelling units also in the RD1.5-1-RIO Zone. Properties east, across Tujunga Avenue of the project site are zoned RD1.5-1-RIO, and are currently improved with one-story single family dwelling and duplex. Properties to the south are all multi-family dwellings and zoned RD1.5-1-RIO. Immediately adjacent to the west, it is zoned R1-1-RFA-RIO and is developed with one and two-story single-family homes. The project site abuts Tujunga Avenue, a designated Avenue II dedicated to a variable width of 80 and 83-feet at the project site's street frontage, and is improved with curb and sidewalk. Sarah Street and Landale Street, the closest intersecting streets of Tujunga Avenue, are designated Local Streets – Standard and dedicated to a width of 51.5-feet and 60-feet, respectively. The subject property is located within a liquefaction zone.		
PROJECT LOCATION: 4531 N TUJUNGA AVE		
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: SHERMAN OAKS - STUDIO CITY - TOLUCA LAKE - CAHUENGA PASS STATUS: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Conform to Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT Conform to Plan	AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: SOUTH VALLEY	CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: STUDIO CITY

EXISTING ZONING: RD1.5-1-RIO	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING: 1,500 sq. ft./dwelling unit	LA River Adjacent:
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: LOW MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION: 8 dwelling units	
	PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY: 8 dwelling units	

Determination (To Be Completed By Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- ☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

Planning Assistant

Title

(213) 978-1840

Phone

Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AESTHETICS	<input type="checkbox"/> GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> POPULATION AND HOUSING
<input type="checkbox"/> AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	<input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC SERVICES
<input type="checkbox"/> AIR QUALITY	<input type="checkbox"/> HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	<input type="checkbox"/> RECREATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LAND USE AND PLANNING	<input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC
<input type="checkbox"/> CULTURAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> MINERAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS
<input type="checkbox"/> GEOLOGY AND SOILS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOISE	<input type="checkbox"/> MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)

Background

PROPONENT NAME:

Tujunga Village, INC.
C/O Apik Minassian

PHONE NUMBER:

(213) 489-4372

APPLICANT ADDRESS:

208 East Sixth Street Suite A-11
Los Angeles, CA 90014

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:

Department of City Planning

DATE SUBMITTED:

05/04/2016

PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS

a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?		✓		
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✓	
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				✓
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				✓
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓

III. AIR QUALITY

a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				✓
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			✓	
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✓
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		✓		
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?			✓
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		✓	
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		✓	
e.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that is listed or determined eligible for listing on the California register of historical resources, listed on a local historical register, or otherwise determined by the lead agency to be a tribal cultural resource?		✓	

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✓
b.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?		✓	
c.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✓
d.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?			✓
e.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓
f.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			✓
g.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?		✓	
h.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			✓

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		✓	
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		✓	

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		✓	
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		✓	
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			✓
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			✓

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				✓
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			✓	
e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				✓
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✓
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a.	Physically divide an established community?		✓		
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓

XII. NOISE

a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓		
----	--	--	---	--	--

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		✓		
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓		
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			✓	
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓	
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c.	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?				✓
b.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Police protection?				✓
c.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Schools?				✓
d.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks?			✓	
e.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Other public facilities?				✓

XV. RECREATION

a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✓
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Potentially significant impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				✓
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			✓	
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS					
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
c.	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✓
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			✓	
c.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓	

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The Environmental Impact Assessment includes the use of official City of Los Angeles and other government source reference materials related to various environmental impact categories (e.g., Hydrology, Air Quality, Biology, Cultural Resources, etc.). The State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology - Seismic Hazard Maps and reports, are used to identify potential future significant seismic events; including probable magnitudes, liquefaction, and landslide hazards. Based on applicant information provided in the Master Land Use Application and Environmental Assessment Form, impact evaluations were based on stated facts contained therein, including but not limited to, reference materials indicated above, field investigation of the project site, and any other reliable reference materials known at the time.

Project specific impacts were evaluated based on all relevant facts indicated in the Environmental Assessment Form and expressed through the applicant's project description and supportive materials. Both the Initial Study Checklist and Checklist Explanations, in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles's Adopted Thresholds Guide and CEQA Guidelines, were used to reach reasonable conclusions on environmental impacts as mandated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The project as identified in the project description may cause potentially significant impacts on the environment without mitigation. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be issued to avoid and mitigate all potential adverse impacts on the environment by the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions contained and expressed in this document; the environmental case file known as **ENV-2016-1573-MND** and the associated case(s), **VTT-74064-SL**. Finally, based on the fact that these impacts can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant, and based on the findings and thresholds for Mandatory Findings of Significance as described in the California Environmental Quality Act, section 15065, the overall project impact(s) on the environment (after mitigation) **will not:**

- Substantially degrade environmental quality.
- Substantially reduce fish or wildlife habitat.
- Cause a fish or wildlife habitat to drop below self sustaining levels.
- Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community.
- Reduce number, or restrict range of a rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.
- Achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals.
- Result in environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- Result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

All supporting documents and references are contained in the Environmental Case File referenced above and may be viewed in the EIR Unit, Room 763, City Hall.

For City information, addresses and phone numbers: visit the City's website at <http://www.lacity.org> ; City Planning - and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS) cityplanning.lacity.org/ or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763. Seismic Hazard Maps - <http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/> Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/Parcel Information - <http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index01.htm> or City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA".

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:
LILIAN RUBIO	Planning Assistant	(213) 978-1840	07/12/2016

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

I. AESTHETICS

a.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located within an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area. The area has a pattern of low, low medium, and medium residential uses. The project is not located in the vicinity of any dedicated scenic vistas. Therefore, no impact will result.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project site is not located within, or in the vicinity of, scenic vistas or city-designated scenic highways. No natural scenic resources, such as native California trees, or unique geologic features, are located at the site. The project does not involve any significant landform alterations. The proposed land use is similar and compatible with other uses in the immediate vicinity. All the on-site trees will be removed in order to develop the lots as proposed. None of these trees are special, yet the diameter of the Cypress, Pine, and Pear tree qualify per the aforementioned ordinance. All of these trees can be mitigated by the planting of new, drought tolerant trees. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant with mitigation imposed.	I-10
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project site is located within an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area. The project site is located in Height District 1 which limits buildings to a 45-foot height limit in the RD zone. The site is located in a fully developed tract, surrounded by other single-family and multi-family dwelling units. The development of the proposed site would result in a loss of existing vegetation and 6 non-protected trees. However, the project would provide landscaping to enhance the visual aesthetics of the development, including the replacement of vegetation, to be compatible with the site's surroundings. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The surrounding urbanized area is illuminated by street lights and exterior lighting on the residential buildings. The exterior lighting on the proposed single family dwellings would be shielded and would not substantially increase the ambient light levels but would add to existing lighting. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	
----	------------------------------	---	--

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

a.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area of Los Angeles and is not zoned or designated for farmland. Due to its urban setting, the project site and surrounding area are not included in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area of Los Angeles. The project site is currently zoned RD1.5-1-RIO. As the project site and surrounding area do not contain farmland of any type and is not zoned for agricultural use, the proposed project would not conflict with the Williamson Act. Therefore, no impact will result.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area of Los Angeles, currently zoned RD1.5-1-RIO. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact will result.	
d.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area of Los Angeles, currently zoned RD1.5-1-RIO. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact will result.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

e.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area of Los Angeles. Neither the project site nor nearby properties are currently utilized for agricultural or forestry uses and the project is not classified in any "Farmland" category designated by the State of California. The proposed development would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land. Therefore, no impact will occur.	
----	-----------	---	--

III. AIR QUALITY

a.	NO IMPACT	Analysis of the project's air quality impacts was performed through using the sample construction scenarios by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The applicable scenario, a 0.29-acre site after dedication, is below the localized significance thresholds for source receptor area 1. The proposed project of eight small lot residential units is not expected to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) prepared by SCAQMD, nor conflict with the City of Los Angeles General Plan's Air Quality Element. Therefore, no impact will result.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The development of the proposed project would temporarily generate emissions from heavy-duty construction vehicles and construction workers' vehicles, thus contributing to the existing basin-wide air quality violations. However, the project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust Emissions) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. During demolition of the existing structures, compliance with Rule 403 will abate any asbestos-containing materials found present in the building, if applicable. Compliance with Rule 403 would reduce regional particulate matter emissions associated with construction activities and the impacts would be less than significant.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Operational emission impacts are expected to be less than significant.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The proposed project would include the development of eight dwelling units on a 12,794-square foot (0.29 acre) project site. The project site is also adjacent to sensitive land uses (residential dwellings immediately surrounding the site), located less than 25 feet away. Using the 1-Acre Site sample construction scenario to represent the emissions and impacts, the proposed project does not exceed the Localized Significance Thresholds for source receptor area (SRA) 1 at the 25-foot distance mark. The project would not include any land uses that would involve the use, storage, or processing of carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic toxic air contaminants and no toxic airborne emissions would typically result from project implementation. The project site is within 500 feet of the US 101 and the 134 freeway. The proposed facilities (residential developments) do not meet the criteria to require a comprehensive air toxics inventory (done through the Annual Emissions Reporting Program), thus the project is not required to prepare a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) and impacts will be less than significant.</p>	
e.	NO IMPACT	<p>Residential properties are generally not considered substantial point sources of objectionable odors. The project, consisting of eight small lot dwelling units, is unlikely to result in activities that create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, no impacts will occur.</p>	

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a.	NO IMPACT	<p>The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, immediately adjacent to Tujunga Avenue. Vegetation on the project site is limited to ornamental landscaping and 6 non-protected trees, thus lacking habitat supportive of wildlife. Development of the site would not adversely affect any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Therefore, no impact will occur.</p>	
b.	NO IMPACT	<p>The project is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area in Los Angeles and does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. It is not located within a natural landscape block, essential connectivity area, or potential riparian connection, as designated in the</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Fish and Game. Therefore, no impacts would occur.	
c. NO IMPACT	The project is located in an urbanized area of the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area in Los Angeles and does not contain any federally protected wetlands or wetland resources as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impact would occur.	
d. NO IMPACT	The subject site is located in a developed and urbanized region that is mostly segmented and lacks the continuity that is consistent with regions known to support any non-avian candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. Due the highly urbanized nature of the project site and surrounding area, the lack of a major water body, and the limited number of trees, the site does not likely support habitat for native resident or migratory species or contain native nurseries. Additionally, the subject site lacks vegetated habitat supportive of wildlife. Development of the site would not adversely interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. Therefore, no impact will result.	
e. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project site contains no native protected trees and 6 non-protected trees. All existing trees on site would be removed or impacted as part of the project. Mitigation is required in order to ensure impacts to trees on site would be less than significant.	IV-70
f. NO IMPACT	The project site is not designated as an Open Space/Habitat area, nor is it located in, or in the vicinity of, a significant ecological area that may require protection. There are no relevant active ordinances protecting biological resources that may prevent this project from being approved at this time. No impacts to any habitat conservation plans are expected to occur.	
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES		

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

a.	NO IMPACT	<p>The project includes the demolition of two existing triplexes constructed in 1947. The building is not designated under any local, state, or federal designation program and has not been determined eligible for designation under any program through SurveyLA, the citywide survey, or any other survey approved by the Department of City Planning's Office of Historic Resources. The building does not constitute "historical resources" for purposes of CEQA. The project is not located in an area of known archeological resources and the project does not involve any grading or excavation. No impact will result.</p>	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Given the archaeological sensitivity of the general area, there is a possibility that unknown, subsurface archaeological resources may exist at the project site. Project-related excavation for the subterranean levels and building footing may have the potential to uncover archaeological resources. However, if archaeological resources are found during excavation, the project will be required to follow procedures as detailed in the California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	
c.	NO IMPACT	<p>The project is not within or near a Vertebrate Paleontological Site Area; the project will be required to follow procedures as detailed in the California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 if paleontological resources are discovered during grading or construction. Therefore, no impact will result.</p>	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human internment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are found during excavation, the project will need to follow procedures as detailed in the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		Resources Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.	
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The project includes the demolition of two existing triplexes constructed in 1947. The building is not designated under any local, state, or federal designation program and has not been determined eligible for designation under any program through SurveyLA, the citywide survey, or any other survey approved by the Department of City Planning's Office of Historic Resources. The building does not constitute "historical resources" for purposes of CEQA. The project is not located in an area of known archeological resources and the project does not involve any grading or excavation so it is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that is listed or determined eligible for listing on the California register of historical resources, listed on a local historical register, or otherwise determined by the lead agency to be a tribal cultural resource. Compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), relating to the Native American's cultural value will be adhered to. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.</p>	

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a.	NO IMPACT	<p>The project site is within 2.34 km from the Hollywood Fault zone, a B fault type, but is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. Due to the intense seismic environment of Southern California, there is always a potential for blind thrust faults, or otherwise unmapped faults that do not have a surface trace, to be present. Structures will be subject to California Building Code Seismic Standards by the Department of Building and Safety. Therefore, impact will be less than significant.</p>	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The project site is within 2.34 km from the Hollywood Fault zone. Any development that occurs within the geographic boundaries of Southern California has the potential of exposing people and/or structures to potentially adverse effects</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	involving potential blind thrust faults, the rupture of known and/or unknown earthquake faults, or strong seismic shaking. However, new development will be required to comply with the seismic safety requirements in the California Building Code (CBC) and California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Special Publication 117 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California [1997]) which provides guidance for evaluating and mitigating earthquake-related hazards as approved by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant.	
c. NO IMPACT	The project site is located within a liquefaction zone as shown on the "Seismic Hazard Zones" map issued by the State of California. The Liquefaction study included as part of the report/s demonstrates that the site does not possess a liquefaction potential. According to the Soils Report Approval Letter issued on June 3, 2016 by the Department of Building and Safety, this satisfies the requirement of the 2014 Los Angeles City Building Code Section 1802.2.7. Therefore, no impact will occur.	
d. NO IMPACT	The project is level and not susceptible to landslides. The building is exiting with no proposed structural changes. The proposed project wishes to develop eight new small lot homes. No impact will result.	
e. NO IMPACT	The project would grade and export less than the 1,000-cubic yard threshold for CEQA significance in hillside areas. Construction of the proposed project would result in ground surface disturbance during site clearance, excavation, and grading, which could create the potential for soil erosion to occur. Site preparation would require removal of all vegetation, any unsuitable fill, and asphalt and concrete paving, exposing pervious surfaces to wind and rainfall. All on-site grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		the LAMC, and conditions imposed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter. Therefore, no impact will result.	
f.	NO IMPACT	The subject site is on a hillside area, but is not located within a landslide zone but is located in a liquefaction zone. The site is not located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. Additionally, construction would be required to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. Therefore, no impact will result.	
g.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Expansive soils have relatively high clay material and expand with the addition of water and shrink when dried, which can cause damage to overlying structures. Soils on the project site may have the potential to shrink and swell resulting from changes in the moisture content. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code, the Universal Building Code and other applicable building codes. In addition, the project would have to comply with the conditions recommended by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. Compliance with such requirements would reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less than significant level.	
h.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in a highly urbanized area where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project is expected to be serviced by the City's existing sanitary sewer available in Tujunga Avenue adjoining the project site. Therefore, no impact will result.	

VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The City of Los Angeles has adopted the LA Green Plan to provide a citywide plan for achieving the City's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In order to implement the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, the Los Angeles City	
----	------------------------------	--	--

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		<p>Council has adopted multiple ordinances to establish the current Los Angeles Green Building Code (LAGBC) (Ordinance No. 179,890). The LAGBC requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. As the LAGBC includes applicable provisions of the State's CALGreen Code, a new development project that can demonstrate it complies with the LAGBC is considered consistent with statewide GHG reduction goals and policies including AB32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006). Through required implementation of the LAGBC, the proposed project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. Therefore, the proposed project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>The project would provide infill residential development proximate to a major transportation corridor and would not interfere with SCAQ's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The proposed project would provide eight residential units to meet demand for housing in proximity to urban uses, including transportation/transit, and would provide a healthy environment by reducing vehicle trips and corresponding GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with statewide, regional and local goals and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and would result in a less-than-significant impact related to GHG reduction plans.</p>	
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>Construction activities have the potential to result in the release, emission, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would provide for an infill development of residential uses. These types of uses would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, (eg. cleaners, solvents, etc). Nevertheless, all hazardous materials within the project site would be acquired,</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements to reduce impacts to less than significant.	
b. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The demolition of the existing residential dwellings, built in 1947, could result in the release of asbestos and there may be lead paint on the buildings. Safe construction practices would be exercised through compliance with the City of Los Angeles Building Code. If any asbestos-containing materials are found present in the building, it would need to be abated in compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403 as well as all other applicable State and Federal rules and regulations. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.	
c. NO IMPACT	There are no schools located approximately 500 feet of the project site. The proposed project would provide residential uses which would be expected to use and store very small amounts of hazardous materials, such as paints, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, etc. Nevertheless, all hazardous materials within the project site would be acquired, handled, used, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements. The site is not located on a hazardous materials list. No impact will result.	
d. NO IMPACT	A review of EnviroStor – the database of the California Department of Toxic Substances – identified no records of hazardous waste facilities on the project site. The project is not located on a site that is identified as a hazardous waste facility subject to corrective action, nor on a site listed pursuant to Section 25356 of the Health and Safety Code, nor on a site included on the Abandoned Site Assessment Program, nor at a hazardous Waste/Border Zone property. Therefore, no impact will result.	
e. NO IMPACT	The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan boundary or an airport hazard area. Therefore, no impact will result.	
f. NO IMPACT	The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact will result.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

g.	NO IMPACT	The proposed project would not interfere with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, no impact will result.	
h.	NO IMPACT	The project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The proposed small lot homes are not expected to increase the fire hazard in the project area and would be required to meet all fire safety requirements of the Department of Building and Safety and the Los Angeles Fire Department. Therefore, no impact will result. See the Public Services section for more details.	

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a.	NO IMPACT	As is typical of most non-industrial urban development, stormwater runoff from the proposed project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants into the stormwater system. Pollutants would be associated with runoff from landscaped areas (pesticides and fertilizers) and paved surfaces (ordinary household cleaners). The proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. Therefore, no impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. The proposed project would not reduce any percolation of surface water into the groundwater table. The project would directly comply with Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.70. This is associated with the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance which is a storm water management strategy that seeks to prevent impacts of runoff and storm water pollution as close to its source as possible. Therefore, no impact will result.	
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The urbanized project vicinity does not contain any significant drainage features such as streams or rivers. Project construction would temporarily expose on-site soils to surface water runoff. During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. Since the existing project site is almost entirely impervious, impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the proposed project would not substantially change the volume or direction of storm water runoff. The project would also be required to comply with Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.70, Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control, which would reduce erosion and siltation to a less than significant level.</p>	
d. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	<p>During project operation, storm water or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that are currently receiving surface water runoff under existing conditions. The project site is mostly impervious and would remain similarly impervious after the proposed development. Thus, impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not substantially change the volume of storm water runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Accordingly, significant alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. The project would comply with Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.70 to keep this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>	
e. NO IMPACT	<p>Development of the proposed project would maintain existing drainage patterns (since the site is currently substantially paved); site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Since the project site is almost entirely impervious, impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not significantly change the volume of storm water runoff. Accordingly, since the volume of runoff from the site would not measurably increase over existing conditions, water runoff after development would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems. The project would also directly comply with Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 64.70. This is associated with the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance which is a storm water management strategy that seeks to prevent impacts of runoff and storm water pollution as close to its</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		source as possible. Therefore, no impact will result.	
f.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The proposed project does not involve industrial or other activities that would substantially degrade water quality. The project does not propose any long-term activities that would discharge into surface water bodies. Some pollutants common to urban areas, especially those related to automobiles, are contained in water runoff control; these pollutants include oil, grease, metals, and hydrocarbons from streets, parking lots, and driveways, dirt from unpaved areas, herbicides, pesticides and fertilizer from landscaped areas and animal wastes. However, there will be an increased potential to degrade water quality standards during the grading and construction period. Impacts would be less than significant through compliance with the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance.	
g.	NO IMPACT	The property is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impact will result.	
h.	NO IMPACT	The property is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impact will result.	
i.	NO IMPACT	The project site does not fall within a Potential Inundation Area or a flood plain, nor would it be affected by a base flood. Therefore, no impact will result.	
j.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located approximately 27.8 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. The site does not fall within a Potential Inundation Area nor within a designated Tsunami Inundation zone. The project site also is not located in a hillside area downslope from any protected grade, nor in an area identified as susceptible to landslides, both of which increase site vulnerability to mudslides or mudflows. Therefore, no impact will result.	

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project is surrounded by residential properties. The project would not propose the placement of a new roadway or other physical barriers which could physically divide an established community. The project would not involve any street vacation or closure, or result in development of new thoroughfares or highways. No separation of uses or disruption of	X-60
----	--	--	------

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		access between land use types would occur as a result of this proposed project. The project site is within 500 feet of the US 101 and the 134 freeway. The proposed project is consistent with the existing physical arrangement of the properties within the vicinity of the site but would require mitigation to ensure impacts near freeways is reduced to less than significant.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project site is designated by the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan Area as Low Medium Residential land uses. The basic use of the property is consistent with the aforementioned plans. Low Medium II Residential land uses are allowed in RD1.5-1-RIO zone lots. Therefore, the proposed development would conform to the allowable land uses and no impact would result.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The project site is not located within a significant ecological area. It is not designated as an Open Space/Habitat area, nor is it located in, or in the vicinity of a significant ecological area that may require protection. Moreover, the site is not located within one of the California Regional Conservation Plans, as designated by the Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Community Conservation Planning program. There are no relevant active ordinances protecting biological resources that may prevent this project from being approved at this time. Therefore, no impact would result.	

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

a.	NO IMPACT	The project site is located in a developed, urban setting and is not likely to be a suitable site for mining of any sort, surface or otherwise. There is no knowledge of the presence of mineral resources that would be of value to the region and residents of the state on the project site. Also, the project site is not located in a known oil field or in a known area of mineral resources. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in a loss of availability of said mineral resources.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project is not located within a Surface Mining District or an MRZ-2 Area, and is not delineated in the City's General Plan Framework, nor in any other land use plan, as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Much of the land	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

	has been developed with structures and is inaccessible for mining extraction. The proposed project would not involve any mineral or oil extraction activities.	
--	--	--

XII. NOISE

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	A temporary increase in noise levels is expected to occur during the heavy construction phase, due to the heavy construction equipment and related construction activity, and could be audible to the closest residents to the project site. Construction noise for the project would be subject to Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) and 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) regarding construction hours and construction equipment noise thresholds. The project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance Nos. 144,331 and 161,574, which prohibit the emission of noises beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible.	XII-20
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The project proposes to build single-family residences on property that is within 500 feet of noise sensitive uses such as single- and multi-family residences. A temporary increase in groundborne vibration is expected to occur during the construction phase, due to the heavy construction equipment and related construction activity, and could be audible to the closest residents to the project site. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The construction activities are expected to be short-term and the applicant would be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance.	XII-20
c.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project may result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels from operational sources; however, the anticipated increase does not meet or exceed the impact threshold of 75 or more dwelling units, nor have the potential to generate 1,000 or more average daily vehicle trips. The project will comply with Los Angeles Municipal	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		Code Chapter XI Noise Regulation, which will mitigate any unnecessary, excessive, and annoying noise from the proposed project. Therefore, impact will be less than significant.	
d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	The anticipated increase in noise levels during construction could be audible to the noise-sensitive uses in the vicinity of the project, including the single- and multi-family residences surrounding the site. Yet, duration of the construction activities are expected to be short-term and Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 41.40 establishes the permitted construction/demolition hours.	XII-20
e.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Additionally, the project site is not located within an airport land use plan boundary or an airport hazard area. Land use incompatibility is most likely to occur for most types of noise-sensitive uses when they are within the 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour. The 65 CNEL standard is the basis for establishing the Airport Influence Area in the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The project does not fall within the Airport Influence Area of the Santa Monica Airport; thus, potential impacts are considered less than significant.	
f.	NO IMPACT	The project is not located within a private airstrip. No impact would result.	

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	Although two triplexes will be demolished, the project would result in a net increase of eight dwelling units, located in a dense, urbanized area. The proposed project would increase residents in the area but would not be considered a substantial increase in population for the Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake –Cahuenga Pass Community Plan area. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project would demolish two triplexes and construct eight small lot dwelling units. This would result in a net increase of housing stock. Therefore, no impact will result.	
c.	NO IMPACT	The proposed project would result in the demolition of two triplexes. However, no tenants currently reside on the project site, thus the project would not displace any people and no impact will result.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a.	NO IMPACT	<p>The area in which the project is proposed is currently being served by the Los Angeles Fire Department, Station No. 86, Vineland Ave, Toluca Lake, CA 91602 (0.9 miles southeast of the project site). This is within the 1.5 mile maximum response distance for engine companies for neighborhood land uses. The project is not proposing to use, manufacture, or store toxic, readily-combustible or otherwise hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact will occur.</p>	
b.	NO IMPACT	<p>The area in which the project is proposed is currently being served by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), North Hollywood Division, located at 11640 Burbank Boulevard, North Hollywood, CA 91601 (approximately 1.8 miles northeast of the project site). The proposed project is for the construction of eight new small lot homes. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the LAPD would review the project plans to ensure that the design of the project follows the LAPD's Design Out Crime Program, an initiative that introduces the techniques of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) to all City Departments beyond the LAPD. Through incorporation of these techniques into the project design, in combination with the safety features already incorporated in the proposed project, the proposed project would neither create capacity/service level problems nor result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection. Therefore, no impact will result.</p>	
c.	NO IMPACT	<p>The proposed project does not meet a threshold of 75 or more residential units to require review by the Los Angeles School District. The project would export 0-500 cubic yards of dirt from the site, which is below the 20,000-cubic yard threshold for a haul route approval by nearby schools. The site is not located within 500 feet of any school, therefore not necessitating mitigation measures to reduce the project's environmental impact. Therefore, no impact will result.</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

d.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project site does not meet the threshold of 50 or more residential units to be considered as a significant impact. No substantial physical deterioration of the facilities is anticipated to occur. The project may increase the use of local parks; however, the impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by payment of Quimby fees.	
e.	NO IMPACT	The Los Angeles Public Library currently serves the project site. The proposed project does not meet a threshold of 75 residential units or more to significantly impact the remaining other public facilities, such as libraries and additional infrastructure. While the increase in population as a result of the proposed project may create a demand for library services, the proposed project would not create substantial capacity or service level problems that would require the provision of new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of service for libraries. Therefore, no impact will result.	

XV. RECREATION

a.	NO IMPACT	The project proposal is the construction of eight small lot homes to replace the existing two triplexes on site, leading to a slight increase in the net population, and thereby slightly increasing demand for recreation and park services. However, the proposed project does not meet a threshold of 50 or more residential units to require review by the Department of Recreation and Parks. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.	
b.	NO IMPACT	The project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities beyond the limits of the project site. The project would result in a slight increase of net population, thus slightly increasing demand for recreation and park services. There are existing parks and recreational facilities within one mile of the project site that are available to the future residents and visitors to the site. The proposed project would not in and of itself increase the demands upon recreational facilities to the level where a new park would need to be constructed, which would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, no impacts will occur.	

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
NO IMPACT	The project site, located on a hillside, would grade and export less than 500 cubic yards of dirt. This amount is less than the 1,000-cubic yard threshold for the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. A haul route approval is not required. The estimated trip generation is below the 500 daily trips threshold for potentially significant impact. The proposed project also does not reach the 25 daily trip threshold that would trigger a preliminary review by the Department of Transportation (DOT), nor does it conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Therefore, no impacts will result.	
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The estimated trip generation is below the 500 daily trips threshold for potentially significant impact. The proposed project also does not reach the 25 daily trip threshold that would trigger a preliminary review by the Department of Transportation (DOT). Although the project would result in an increase in vehicular traffic, the increase is expected to have a less than significant impact on applicable congestion management programs.	
NO IMPACT	The project does not include any aviation-related uses. The maximum building height allowed in the Height District 1 for the RD zone is 45 feet. The project is below the 45 feet allowed. This does not result in an impact to existing flight paths in the Los Angeles Basin nor is the project significantly higher than surrounding buildings. Therefore, no impacts to air traffic patterns are expected to occur.	
NO IMPACT	The project does not include any hazardous design features or incompatible uses with surrounding land uses. Currently the uses on the site are accessed from Tujunga Avenue. A parking and driveway plan will be submitted to the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) for review. LADOT anticipates no impact from the proposed project.	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

e.	NO IMPACT	<p>The eight-unit subdivision would front public street Tujunga Avenue. The project does not meet the threshold of generating 500 or more daily trips, or 43 or more vehicle trips, during either the A.M. or P.M. peak hours to be considered a significant impact. The project driveway is not proposed on a Avenue I or Avenue II, nor does it intersect an on-street bicycle land or cross a sidewalk in an area of high pedestrian activity. The proposed project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns, impede public access or travel on public rights-of-way. Development of the project site may require temporary and/or partial street closures due to construction activities. Any such closures would be short-term and required to be coordinated with the Los Angeles Departments of Transportation, Building and Safety, and Public Works. While such closures may cause inconvenience, they are not expected to substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. Additionally, the proposed project is required to meet all fire and safety requirements of the Los Angeles Building and Safety Department, Police Department, and Fire Department to ensure that all access roads, driveways, and parking areas would remain accessible to emergency service vehicles. Therefore, no impact would result.</p>	
f.	NO IMPACT	<p>The proposed project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes, or bicycle routes. The project will not impede the implementation of any adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, no impact would result.</p>	
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
a.	NO IMPACT	<p>The Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) experiences an average daily flow of 362 million gallons per day (MGD), below a capacity of 450 mgd. As a proportion of total average daily flow experienced by the HTP, the wastewater generation of the proposed project would account for a small percentage of average daily wastewater flow. This increase in wastewater flow would not jeopardize the HTP operations within its established</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

		wastewater treatment requirements. Furthermore, all wastewater from the project would be treated according to requirements of the NPDES permit authorized by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, no impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	Based on the proposed residential unit mixture and the sewage generation factors for the City of Los Angeles, the proposed project would generate wastewater treatment demand for approximately 720 gallons per day (gpd) which would not measurably impact capacity of the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant in Sylmar. Water consumption for the proposed project is estimated from wastewater generation factors. In order to present a conservative analysis, water consumption is assumed to be 120 percent of the wastewater generated for a given land use, as determined by wastewater generation rates in accordance with the Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide and the Bureau of Sanitation. Therefore, no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required and no impact would result.	
c.	NO IMPACT	Development of the proposed project would maintain existing drainage patterns; site-generated surface water runoff would continue to flow to the City's storm drain system. Since the project site is almost entirely impervious, impermeable surfaces resulting from the development of the project would not significantly change the volume of storm water runoff. Accordingly, since the volume of runoff from the site would not measurably increase over existing conditions, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exacerbate any existing deficiencies in the storm drain system or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The proposed project would also be subject to compliance with the LID section of the Development BMP Handbook and no impact would result.	
d.	NO IMPACT	The proposed residential project would construct eight small lot homes to replace the existing two triplexes which is expected to create a slightly increased demand for water. The construction, use, and maintenance of the residences and landscaped areas will comply with the	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	<p>City of Los Angeles Landscape and Water Management Ordinance No. 170,978. The project would comply with Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter XII, Article II Water Closet, Urinal and Showerhead Regulations, and Article V Water Efficiency Requirements, which impose requirements and standards for the construction of new buildings to minimize the effect of any water shortages in the city. Therefore, no impact would result.</p>	
e. NO IMPACT	<p>Based on the proposed eight small lot homes (each unit containing 2 bedrooms) and the sewage generation factors for the City of Los Angeles, the proposed project would generate wastewater treatment demand for approximately 720 gallons per day (gpd). Thus, the project's estimated wastewater treatment demand falls below the significance threshold of 4,000 gpd. Therefore, no impact would result.</p>	
f. NO IMPACT	<p>The City of Los Angeles is served by several landfills within the County of Los Angeles. The proposed development of eight small lot homes is expected to generate well below the threshold of five tons per week. The waste produced by the long-term use of the property would be typical of residential uses and would not create a special need for disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>	
g. NO IMPACT	<p>Solid waste generated on-site by the proposed project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waste, such as the California Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) Act (also known as AB 939). The amount of project-related waste disposed of at area landfills would be reduced through recycling and waste diversion programs implemented by the City, in accordance with the City's Solid Waste Management Policy Plan (CisSWMPP), which is the long-range solid waste management policy for the City, and the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), which is the strategic action policy plan for diverting solid waste from landfills. The project would also comply with applicable regulatory measures, including the provisions of City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 171,687 with regard to all new development: the</p>	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
---------	-------------	---------------------

	provision of source sorted bins to facilitate the separation of recyclable materials, and implementation of a demolition and construction debris recycling plan, with the explicit intent of requiring recycling during all phases of site preparation and building construction. With the implementation of the regulatory measures, waste generated by the project would not significantly alter the projected timeline for landfills within the region to reach capacity. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.	
--	--	--

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a.	NO IMPACT	The proposed project is the construction of eight small lot homes on a site that is currently developed and in a region that is densely populated, mostly segmented and lacks the continuity that is consistent with those known to support any non-avian candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. Moreover, the site has not been identified as being a Significant Ecological Area. The subject site lacks riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, nor does it contain any wetlands. The subject site is not identified as a site or area of historical significance; therefore it is unlikely that the proposed project will have impacts on important examples of major periods of California history. Also, the subject site is not in the vicinity of any archaeological or paleontological sites. Therefore, no impact will occur.	
b.	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project may have environmental impacts which are individually limited but significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects. However, any development activity that may occur must comply with all applicable federal, state and city regulations that would preclude significant cumulative impacts with regards to geology and soils, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and transportation and traffic. Compliance with City regulations and community plans would ensure that any cumulative impacts related to aesthetics and land use would be less than significant. Furthermore, an increase in area populations resulting from the proposed project and other development activity in the area are anticipated to be within forecasts of the City and the Southern	

Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	California Association of Governments (SCAG). Therefore, less than significant cumulative impacts to population and housing are anticipated. Lastly, any potentially significant impacts generated in the any of the environmental sections are anticipated to be less than significant with the application of the City's CEQA thresholds and standard mitigation measures proposed in this document.	
c. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	The project has potential environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. However, these potential impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level through compliance with the aforementioned mitigation measures.	

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

SOILS REPORT APPROVAL LETTER

June 3, 2016

LOG # 93092
SOILS/GEOLOGY FILE - 2
LIQ

To: Jim Tokunaga, Deputy Advisory Agency
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, 7th Floor, Room 750

From: John Weight, Grading Division Chief
Department of Building and Safety

Tentative Tract: VTT 74064
LOT(S): 1 - 8
LOCATION: 4531 - 4535 N. Tujunga Avenue

<u>CURRENT REFERENCE</u> <u>REPORT/LETTER(S)</u>	<u>REPORT</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>DATE(S) OF</u> <u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>PREPARED BY</u>
Soils Report	6531	12/15/2015	SubSurface Designs, Inc.

The Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety has reviewed the Tentative Tract VTT 74064 with Los Angeles Department of City Planning receipt stamp dated 05/04/2016 and the referenced report providing recommendations for the proposed new eight-small lot subdivision for three-story at-grade single family residences. The existing one-story structures will be demolished.

Two borings were drilled from 11 to 51 feet in depth. The earth materials at the subsurface exploration locations consist of alluvium described as silty sand to clayey sand and sandy silt. Groundwater was not encountered to the maximum depths explored, and historic high groundwater is at about 20 feet below the surface per the consultants. The near surface alluvial deposits are not considered suitable for foundation support per the consultants and the upper 5 feet of alluvium will be removed and recompacted to support the proposed structures. The site is near level.

The consultants recommend to support the proposed residential structures on conventional foundations bearing on a blanket of properly placed fill a minimum of 3 feet thick below the foundations.

The site is located in a designated liquefaction hazard zone as shown on the "Seismic Hazard Zones" map issued by the State of California. The Liquefaction study included as a part of the report demonstrates that the site does not possess a liquefaction potential (based on 2/3rds of PGAm). This satisfies the requirement of the 2014 Los Angeles City Building Code Section 1802.2.7.

The Tentative Tract VTT 74064 and the referenced report are acceptable, provided the following conditions are complied with during site development:

(Note: Numbers in parenthesis () refer to applicable sections of the 2014 City of LA Building Code. P/BC numbers refer the applicable Information Bulletin. Information Bulletins can be accessed on the internet at LADBS.ORG.)

1. The soils engineer shall review and approve the detailed plans prior to issuance of any permit. This approval shall be by signature on the plans that clearly indicates the soils engineer has reviewed the plans prepared by the design engineer and that the plans included the recommendations contained in the soils report. (7006.1)
2. All recommendations of the report by SubSurface Designs, Inc., dated 12/15/2015 and signed by Jonathan Edward Mahn, RCE 60293, which are in addition to or more restrictive than the conditions contained herein shall also be incorporated into the plans for the project. (7006.1)
3. A copy of the subject and appropriate referenced reports and this approval letter shall be attached to the District Office and field set of plans. Submit one copy of the above reports to the Building Department Plan Checker prior to issuance of the permit. (7006.1)
4. A grading permit shall be obtained for all structural fill. (106.1.2)
5. Approval shall be obtained from the utility company with regard to proposed construction within or adjacent to the rear utility easement. (7006.6)
6. Retaining walls are not approved in this letter.
7. All man-made fill shall be compacted to a minimum 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the fill material per the latest version of ASTM D 1557. Where cohesionless soil having less than 15 percent finer than 0.005 millimeters is used for fill, it shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction based on maximum dry density (D1556). Placement of gravel in lieu of compacted fill is allowed only if complying with Section 91.7011.3 of the Code. (7011.3)
8. If import soils are used, no footings shall be poured until the soils engineer has submitted a compaction report containing in-place shear test data and settlement data to the Grading Division of the Department, and obtained approval. (7008.2)
9. Compacted fill shall extend beyond the footings a minimum distance equal to the depth of the fill below the bottom of footings or a minimum of five feet, whichever is greater, as recommended.
10. Existing uncertified fill, if any, shall not be used for support of footings, concrete slabs or new fill. (1809.2)
11. Drainage in conformance with the provisions of the Code shall be maintained during and subsequent to construction. (7013.12)
12. Grading shall be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season, or detailed temporary erosion control plans shall be filed in a manner satisfactory to the Grading Division of the Department and the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, B-Permit Section, for any grading work in excess of 200 cu yd. (7007.1)
6262 Van Nuys Blvd. Ste 351, Van Nuys (818) 374-4605
13. All loose foundation excavation material shall be removed prior to commencement of framing. (7005.3)
14. The applicant is advised that the approval of this report does not waive the requirements for excavations contained in the State Construction Safety Orders enforced by the State Division of Industrial Safety. (3301.1)

15. Temporary excavations that remove lateral support to the public way, adjacent property, or adjacent structures shall be constructed using ABC slot cuts, as recommended. Note: Lateral support shall be considered to be removed when the excavation extends below a plane projected downward at an angle of 45 degrees from the bottom of a footing of an existing structure, from the edge of the public way or an adjacent property. (3307.3.1)
16. Prior to the issuance of any permit which authorizes an excavation where the excavation is to be of a greater depth than are the walls or foundation of any adjoining building or structure and located closer to the property line than the depth of the excavation, the owner of the subject site shall provide the Department with evidence that the adjacent property owner has been given a 30-day written notice of such intent to make an excavation. (3307.1)
17. Unsurcharged temporary excavation may be cut vertical up to 5 feet. Excavations over 5 feet shall be trimmed back at a gradient not exceeding 1:1 (horizontal to vertical), from top to bottom of excavation, as recommended.
18. Surcharged A-B-C slot-cut method may be used for temporary excavations with each slot cut not exceeding 5 feet in height and not exceeding 8 feet in width, as recommended. The surcharge load shall not exceed the value given in the report. The soils engineer shall determine the clearance between the excavation and the existing foundation. The soils engineer shall verify in the field if the existing earth materials are stable in the slot cut excavation. Each slot shall be inspected by the soils engineer and approved in writing prior to any worker access.
19. All residential foundations shall derive entire support from a blanket of properly placed fill a minimum of 3 feet thick below the foundations, as recommended and approved by the soils engineer by inspection.
20. Footings supported on approved compacted fill or expansive soil shall be reinforced with a minimum of four (4) ½-inch diameter (#4) deformed reinforcing bars. Two (2) bars shall be placed near the bottom and two (2) bars placed near the top.
21. All foundations and slabs shall be designed for expansive conditions, as recommended on page 10 of the referenced report.
22. Slabs placed on approved compacted fill shall be at least 3½ inches thick and shall be reinforced with ½-inch diameter (#4) reinforcing bars spaced maximum of 16 inches on center each way.
23. The seismic design shall be based on a Site Class D as recommended. All other seismic design parameters shall be reviewed by LADBS building plan check.
24. The structure shall be connected to the public sewer system. (P/BC 2014-027)
25. All roof and pad drainage shall be conducted to the street in an acceptable manner. (7013.10)
26. All concentrated drainage shall be conducted in an approved device and disposed of in a manner approved by the LADBS. (7013.10)
27. The soils engineer shall inspect all excavations to determine that conditions anticipated in the report have been encountered and to provide recommendations for the correction of hazards found during grading. (7008 & 1705.6)

28. Prior to the pouring of concrete, a representative of the consulting soils engineer shall inspect and approve the footing excavations. He/She shall post a notice on the job site for the LADBS Building Inspector and the Contractor stating that the work so inspected meets the conditions of the report, but that no concrete shall be poured until the City Building Inspector has also inspected and approved the footing excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be filed with the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the work. (108.9 & 7008.2)
29. Prior to excavation, an initial inspection shall be called with LADBS Inspector at which time sequence of construction, ABC slot cuts, protection fences and dust and traffic control will be scheduled. (108.9.1)
30. Installation of shoring, underpinning, slot cutting excavations and/or pile installation shall be performed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer and deputy grading inspector. (1705.6)
31. Prior to the placing of compacted fill, a representative of the soils engineer shall inspect and approve the bottom excavations. He/She shall post a notice on the job site for the City Grading Inspector and the Contractor stating that the soil inspected meets the conditions of the report, but that no fill shall be placed until the LADBS Grading Inspector has also inspected and approved the bottom excavations. A written certification to this effect shall be included in the final compaction report filed with the Grading Division of the Department. All fill shall be placed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer. A compaction report together with the approved soil report and Department approval letter shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the compaction. In addition, an Engineer's Certificate of Compliance with the legal description as indicated in the grading permit and the permit number shall be included. (7011.3)
32. No footing/slab shall be poured until the compaction report is submitted and approved by the Grading Division of the Department.



GR/gr

Log No. 93092

213-482-0480

cc: Tujunga Village, LLC, Owner
Iacobellis & Associates, Inc., Applicant
SubSurface Designs, Inc., Project Consultant
VN District Office

SOLAR ENERGY
FEASIBILITY REPORT (**PRELIMINARY****)**

PREPARED BY:

Solargy, Inc.
22028 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 207
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
(818) 347-6096 www.solargy.com
February 20, 2016 Job# 16021105



TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NUMBER:

74064

PROJECT ADDRESS:

4531-4135 Tujunga Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 91326

OWNER:

Tujunga Village, LLC
208 East Sixth Street *GTE D-11*
Los Angeles, CA 90014
(213) 499-4372

EXISTING LAND USE:

Two triplexes.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project consists of 8 lots, each with a multi-story single-family home and an individual grade level garage. The maximum height of the new homes above grade is about 42 feet. Minimum setback from the Tujunga Avenue property line is 22 feet. Minimum setback from the north and south property lines is 5 feet. Minimum setback from the west property line is 3 inches. Roofs are suitable for collector mounting on same; racks may be needed to increase the tilt.

ADJACENT LAND USE AND STRUCTURES:

To the east, about 85 feet across Tujunga Avenue, is a 1-story single family residence and a 1-story duplex. To the north, with a setback of 5 feet, is a 1-story single-family residence. To the west, with minimal setbacks, are garages and beyond 1-story single-family residences. To the south, with a setback of about 5 feet, is a 2-story duplex. Solar access is somewhat affected by adjacent land use.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The topography of the site is basically flat. The site is rectangular and has 100 feet of frontage on Tujunga Avenue with a maximum depth of the site westward therefrom of 170.88 feet. Solar access to the south is good for roof-mounted collectors. Access to the prevailing winds from the west is fair because of the distance to, and height of, the residential structures to the west. There will be self-blockage.

PASSIVE FEATURES:

The homes will be wood frame type, which is not useful for passive heat storage. Although no specific passive features are contemplated at this time, Title 24 regulations that went into effect July 1, 2014, mandate many passive features and devices; e.g. a minimum R-13 and R-30 insulation in walls and roofs, respectively.

ACTIVE SOLAR SYSTEMS:

The project is not now planned for active Solar. Future retrofitting for solar could be accomplished. In order for the new structures to comply with the energy regulations, it is not necessary to have active solar. Water heating would require about 50 square feet of collector and 80 gallons of storage per unit. Photovoltaic systems are usually not cost effective unless heavily subsidized.

PASSIVE OR NATURAL HEATING AND COOLING AND ENERGY CONSERVATION REPORT

1. GENERAL CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

Los Angeles (San Fernando Valley) is located in Solar Zone 5 of the state as determined by the State Energy Commission. The climate is normally pleasant and mild throughout the year. The Pacific Ocean is the primary modifying influence, but coastal mountain ranges lying along the north and east sides of the Los Angeles coastal basin act as a buffer against extremes of summer heat and winter cold occurring in desert and plateau regions in the interior. A variable balance between mild sea breezes and either hot or cold winds from the interior results in some variety in weather conditions, but temperature and humidity are usually within the limits of human comfort.

Approximate Annual Climatological Data for the area is as follows:

Temperature (°F)	63.6	
Heating Degree Days	1800	
Cooling Degree Days	1310	
Freeze Days	<1	
Precipitation (inches)	16.12	
Relative Humidity	5 a.m.	75%
	10 a.m.	53%
	5 p.m.	53%
	10 p.m.	72%

Approximate Annual Solar Radiation Data for the area is as follows:

Radiation (KBtu/Ft ²)	Horizontal	549
	Direct Beam	644
% Possible Sunshine		.73
Mean Cloud Cover		.40
Fraction Extraterrestrial Radiation		.57

Compared to many areas of the country, the location is a very good one for solar energy applications.

Wind	June	July	August	September
Mean Speed (mph)	5.7	5.4	5.3	5.3
Maximum Speed (mph)	32	21	24	27
Prevailing Direction	W	W	W	W

2. SITE ORIENTATION

The site is rectangular in shape with long axis east/west. This is good for passive gain, but as it stands passive heating is not planned and hence no passive devices are contemplated except those that are required by the Title 24 energy analysis.

3. BUILDING CONFIGURATION AND ORIENTATION

Ideally, the homes on the proposed site would have their long axis east-west but this is not the case; no passive design is planned.

4. ADJACENT BUILDINGS

There is shading of the site by adjacent buildings. Reflected solar radiation, although minimal, cannot be avoided. Access to the prevailing winds from the west is fair because of the distance to, and height of, the residential structures to the west. There will be self-blockage.

5. EXTERIOR WALLS

The walls will be insulated (R-13 or more), caulked and weather-stripped in accordance with Title 24 energy regulations. Light stucco, if used, will reduce the cooling load in summer.

6. ROOF

The roofs may be suitable for solar collecting devices. Racks may be needed for proper tilt. It is likely that tile or built-up roofing, which tend to be dark, will be used. However, a City of Los Angeles ordinance requires cool roofs.

7. WINDOWS

Some windows may require special treatment. Title 24 energy calculations will probably require dual pane Low-E windows to be used on this project.

8. ROOM USE

Passive heating and cooling (primary source) will not be utilized, so living areas have not been planned with this as a major constraint.

9. SPACE CONDITIONING

Care will be exercised in sizing and installing equipment as oversized units cost more to purchase and operate. An SEER of 14.0 or greater will be required on all new condensers, if manufactured after January 1, 2015. Minimum furnace AFUE will be 80 and heat pump HSPF will be 8.2. Installation of other devices such as zone damper controls is being considered. Automatic thermostats and electronically controlled ignition devices will be mandatory.

10. TREES AND VEGETATION

Landscape plans will consider the items below. Vegetation can provide both shade and insulation. Deciduous trees offer summer shade but allow solar energy to enter in the winter months. Trees with low foliage can shade east or west windows from a low altitude sun. Evergreens provide good shade in summer, insulate in winter and reduce heat loss at night. Outside ground planting reduces absorbed solar energy hence lowers the outdoor temperature. Lack of area and as well as building height, may not allow implementation of the above principles.

11. WATER CONSERVATION

Water conservation by itself is an important goal. California is highly susceptible to water shortages so conservation of this vital resource is necessary. Conserving water conserves energy, particularly hot water uses such as sinks, dishwashers, showers, clothes washers and water heaters. Water-saving and energy-conserving appliances in compliance with Title 24 will be used. The landscape architect will be instructed to investigate low water consumption plantings and low waste watering systems.

12. FUTURE ACTIVE SOLAR SYSTEMS

The Solar Index is a number between 0 and 100 which measures the amount of heat that could be supplied on a given day by a solar system. Analyses are based on a system using 80 to 90 ft² of flat collectors serving a family of four using 80 gallons of hot water per day. A Solar Index (SI) of 75 means that 75% of the heat required for hot water could have been provided by the sun. The SI for Los Angeles ranges from 40 (winter worst) to 85 (summer best). There will probably be sufficient room on the roofs for the collectors. Photovoltaic systems require much more area than hot water systems so that might discourage their use, not to mention the economics of their implementation. The roofs will probably support the added weight as designed, but structural calculations would be required.

13. GREEN BUILDING CODE

All the provisions of the Green Building Code appropriate to this building at the time of permitting will be adhered to.

January 26, 2016

Tujunga Village LLC
C/O Mr. Mardik Oruncakiel
208 E 6th St
Los Angeles, CA 90014

177 74064-56

Horticultural Tree Report

Townhouse Complex @ 4531-4535 Tujunga Ave, Los Angeles

Dear Mr. Oruncakiel,

I have reviewed the on-site trees at the above mentioned addresses. The City of Los Angeles Ordinance 177,404 requires that all trees be inventoried as defined by the ordinance criteria. We are providing you with this correspondence and tree map showing the species of trees.

On January 25, 2016 I reviewed the vegetation on site and found the following on-site trees:

- a. *Agonis flexuosa*, peppermint tree: 1 @ 4" diameter, a healthy ornamental tree
- b. Citrus, orange: 2 @ 3" diameter, fruit trees
- c. *Cupressus sempervirens*, Italian Cypress: 1 @ 6" diameter, a healthy tree on the property line
- d. *Michelia* spp.: 2 @ 2" diameter, one is a street tree
- e. *Pinus halepensis*, Aleppo Pine: 1 @ 8" diameter
- f. *Pyrus kawakamii*, Evergreen Pear: 1 @ 8" diameter

There are off-site trees as well (refer to attached map). None of the off-site trees will be impacted by this development. They are noted as reference. The off-site tree species are: *Eugenia* spp. (3" dia.), citrus spp. (3" dia.), *Erythrina caffra* (10" dia.), *Pinus canariensis* (8" dia.), *Ulmus parvifolia sempervirens* (10" dia.), *Juglans nigra* (12" dia.).

Summary:

All the on-site trees will be removed in order to develop these lots as designed. None of these trees are special, yet the diameter of the cypress, pine, and pear qualify per the aforementioned ordinance. All of these trees can be mitigated by the planting of new, drought tolerant trees.

We will mitigate for the loss of the two 8" diameter trees and one 6" diameter tree in the new landscape. We propose to provide the following as mitigation: 2 x 48" box trees and 1 x 36" box tree. These will be noted on the final landscape plans as mitigation trees.

We did not evaluate the removed species using I.S.A. Values because these are not target species. Furthermore pines and cypress trees are not approved by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. The *Pyrus Kawakamii* tree, if purchased in a nursery today, would be equal to a 8' box size.

We appreciate the opportunity to prepare and present this "Horticultural Tree Report". If you have any questions or comments, please call or email me.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long, sweeping tail that ends in a small hook.

Lee Newman
Landscape Architect
CA License # 1314



xc Anthony Stark

- 5' PINUS CANARIENSIS
- 3' CITRUS SPP
- 3' EUGENIA SPP

12 JUGLANS NERA

LOT 6
TRACT NO 9502
1 STORY
STUCCO GARAGE

LOT 92
TRACT NO 9502
1 STORY
STUCCO GARAGE
(TO BE DEMOLISHED)

LOT 86
TRACT NO 9502
1 STORY
STUCCO GARAGE
(TO BE DEMOLISHED)

- 5' PINUS KAWIYANAE
- 6' CUPRESSUS SEMPERVIRENS

2 STORY

LOT 88
TRACT NO 9502
MULTI-FAMILY

- 4' AGONIS FLEXUOSA
- 5' PINUS MALTENSIS
- 3' MICHELIA SPP
- 3' CITRUS ORANGE
- 2' CITRUS ORANGE

1 STORY

LOT 87
TRACT NO 9502
MULTI-FAMILY

LOT 86
TRACT NO 9502
MULTI-FAMILY

LOT 85
TRACT NO 9502
MULTI-FAMILY

- 10' LIRIODENDRON SEMPERVIRENS



TUJUNGA AVENUE

- 4' MICHELIA SPP
- 10' LIRIODENDRON SEMPERVIRENS

TREE SURVEY
4531-4535 TUJUNGA AV.
JANUARY 25, 2016

PREPARED BY:
LEE NEWMAN
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
CA LICENSE# 1314