

CITY OF  
  
AGOURA HILLS

---

*"Gateway to the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area"*

May 11, 2005

Christina Tran  
County of Los Angeles  
Department of Regional Planning  
Impact Analysis Section, Room 1348  
320 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: COUNTY PROJECT NO. 97-178, CUP NO. 97-178, OTP NO. 97-178, TTM 52419, SCH NO. 1998111091; TRIANGLE RANCH PROJECT DEIR

Dear Ms. Tran:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Triangle Ranch Project. The project involves the subdivision of a roughly 320-acre project site into 81 single-family residential lots, as well as four landscape and five open space lots. The site is located south of Agoura Road along Kanan and Cornell Roads, and is within unincorporated Los Angeles County, near the southern boundary of the City of Agoura Hills. Since the project abuts the City, it would act as the City's southern gateway, and it is likely that many of the future residents of this project would utilize the various services and roadways in the City. The site is located in a sensitive environmental area with oak trees, sensitive species, hillsides and Medea Creek.

The City of Agoura Hills prepared a letter regarding the Notice of Preparation for the DEIR, dated July 27, 2004. We are pleased that many of the comments raised in that letter have been addressed in the DEIR. However, there are still a number of issues that must be addressed. The following are our comments on the content and adequacy of the DEIR.

**Section I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

1. Page I-3, Item B: The DEIR should note if any encroachment permits and/or grading permits from the City of Agoura Hills would be needed. Any work that might be necessary within City limits involving grading of building pads on the edge of the project boundary or fuel modification efforts should be considered. Grading activities over 50 cubic yards require a City grading permit.

2. Page I-8, Item D, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: The text notes that the open space on the site would be maintained by the homeowners' association and/or dedicated to a public agency acceptable to the County of Los Angeles. However, the discussion of consistency with the North Area Plan's Policy IV-8 on page III.K-15 only references a "public agency." To ensure that this land is retained as open space in perpetuity and adequately protected, a conservation easement should be dedicated to a public agency or other non-profit land entity that is experienced in managing open space, not the homeowner's association. Also, an exhibit should be included in the DEIR showing the parcels or areas of the site to be dedicated as open space. Figure I-5 Tentative Tract Map identifies proposed open space lots, but it is not clear if all of these lots would be legally dedicated as open space.
3. Page I-8, Item D, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: The text notes that street lighting would be kept to the minimum required for safety purposes in the area east of Cornell Road, with the area west of Cornell Road consisting of streetlights, sidewalks, curb and gutter. However, given the context of the project within a natural setting, any street lighting, sidewalks, curb and gutter would seem inappropriate and inconsistent with the natural character of the area. On page I-12, the DEIR states that the design concept is to create a semi-rural residential community. The street lighting and typically suburban tract street improvements would be out of character in this semi-rural area.
4. Page I-13: This text does not adequately describe the scope of grading. The height of cut slopes should be identified. The grading plan in the DEIR shows over 60-foot high cut slopes. This is inconsistent with the North Area Plan (NAP) Policy IV-12, as noted on page III.K-16, and therefore measures or alternatives should be identified to reduce the height of these slopes.
5. From the exhibits in the DEIR, it appears that Silver Creek Road is proposed to be extended to Cornell Road. However, the DEIR does not seem to address this improvement. Is this proposed as part of the project? In any case, the DEIR should identify this improvement. If it is to be part of the project, its potential impacts (especially wetland/riparian and drainage and upstream effects) should be assessed in the DEIR.

## **Section II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

6. Table I-1 on page II-18: This list of projects in the City of Agoura Hills is several years old and is outdated, as it contains projects that are already built, been withdrawn, or revised. Attached is an updated list that should be considered as part of the DEIR. Please contact City staff if there are questions regarding this revised information. It is important to have an adequate and up-to-date project list so that the cumulative background impacts can be included as part of the analysis of the proposed project.

### **Section III.A. GEOTECHNICAL HAZARDS - GRADING**

7. This section does not seem to address any blasting or other form of pre-grading rock treatment that may occur due to certain underlying landforms within a portion of the project site. The DEIR should explain what methods are proposed to be utilized, along with addressing any potential impacts from the activities. The City's policy regarding blasting is that it not be permitted. Since the project is adjacent to City limits, the project should not involve blasting.

### **Section III.F. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

8. While the proposed project has been scaled back from previous versions through primarily a reduction in residential units, the project would still result in significant biological impacts to sensitive plants, animals and various habitat communities. The DEIR notes that SEATAC reviewed this project and prior iterations on several occasions. The current project, as noted throughout this section, has only partially, but not fully, addressed the SEATAC's concerns. For example, the text in the first paragraph on page III.F-39 states, "...the development has been partially redesigned in response to SEATAC comments..." Moreover, starting on page III.F-41, the DEIR outlines the many ways in which the project is not in conformance with SEA compatibility criteria. By eliminating or reconfiguring certain residential lots on the site, it appears that the project's impacts can be significantly and feasibly reduced. On page III.F-39, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the DEIR states that, "Areas of the project in close proximity to the *Lyon's pentachaeta* have been pulled back to the maximum extent practicable." The DEIR does not explain why it is not practicable to eliminate or shift additional lots to avoid this endangered plant, as well as avoiding jurisdictional drainages and other sensitive biological resources described in this section, and therefore reduce or eliminate significant impacts. Support of the conclusion on page III.F-41, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, stating that impacts to jurisdictional waters are not considered significant, needs to be provided. This conclusion conflicts with the thresholds of significance outlined on page III.F-33. The project involves the grading and filling of 12 jurisdictional drainages and instead directing flow to a system of underground culverts. This is a significant impact, and will cause direct negative effects to the existing biological resources. The text should describe the habitat in these drainages, and reconsider the magnitude of these impacts. In summary, the impact discussion is insufficient, the mitigation measures do not go far enough in reducing impacts, and there is insufficient discussion as to why further mitigation measures, such as avoiding sensitive areas and plants, are not feasible or practicable. Given the numerous inconsistencies with the SEA compatibility criteria and the fairly extensive significant and unavoidable biological impacts associated with the project, it appears that the subject site is not a favorable location for this type and density of development.

9. Given the numerous biological impacts addressed in this DEIR that would not be mitigated to a less than significant level, this section should explain that approval of the project as proposed would require a statement of overriding considerations by the CEQA Lead Agency.
10. Page III.F, Mitigation Measure F-3: This measure briefly refers to the fuel modification plan and its components. However, this section of the DEIR also needs to include a fuller discussion of the fuel modification zones that would be required for the project. This would include a description of what the fuel modification program would entail, including types of species and plant communities that would remain and those that would be removed; a map showing the zones along with the locations of sensitive species and habitat and the proposed lots and improvements; potential biological impacts from vegetation clearing and revegetation; and any necessary additional mitigation measures. The limits of the fuel modification zones should be considered in this section, as well as other appropriate DEIR sections, as the outer boundary of the affected environment. Also, if the zones cross over the northern portion of the site, into the jurisdiction of the City of Agoura Hills, then coordination with the City will be required. The City would be opposed to any fuel modification that crosses onto City limits, as these areas were donated to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy for purposes of permanent open space preservation and habitat protection. For similar reasons, no grading for project construction (see Lots 3, 4, 5, 13 and 14) should occur on land in the City limits.
11. Page III.F-39, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: This paragraph references the oak tree report and mitigation requirements as a result of impacts to oak trees. The DEIR should clarify if these mitigation measures have been incorporated as part of the project description. If so, these measures should be described in more detail in the text where the various project components are described. Otherwise, the impacts should be further described and the mitigation should be called out more specifically in the list of mitigation measures.
12. Page III.F-45, Mitigation Measure F-1(2): This measure should also include a requirement for a monitoring and maintenance program to ensure that the revegetation is successful. Otherwise, this measure would be useless. As in Mitigation Measure F-2(2), this measure should include a requirement that the monitoring and maintenance program be specified in the CC&Rs as being the responsibility of the Homeowners' Association or other future owner of the land. This mitigation measure should also list that this requirement be written into the deed.
13. Page III.F-43, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: The last sentence notes that the project is in substantial conformance with SEA Compatibility Criterion 3. However, there is no information contained in this paragraph to substantiate this conclusion. Moreover, the DEIR on page III.F-40, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, notes that the project could interrupt east-west movement via Medea Creek and Drainage B, and claims that

this would be considered a significant impact. The DEIR should address these inconsistencies in level of impact.

14. Page III.F-45, Mitigation Measure F-2: Since areas containing *Lyon's pentachaeta* (an endangered species, with this particular series of locations listed in the DEIR as "one of the largest populations known to exist in the Santa Monica Mountains) would be removed for construction of the homes, replanting of this species, not simply preservation of the existing populations, should be required. The basic components of such a plan should be provided in the DEIR. If replanting is not feasible or unlikely to be effective, then the site plan should be revised to avoid these areas altogether.
15. Page III.F-48, Mitigation Measure F-9: This measure mentions a minimum habitat mitigation ratio of 1:1 onsite, and continues to state, "...and no less than 2:1 for mitigation." Please clarify if this last part of the sentence is meant to refer to offsite mitigation. In any case, these ratios are too low. A minimum ratio of 3:1 should be the goal to account for loss of habitat until full growth is established and to account for failure of a certain amount of plantings. Additionally, while a final habitat mitigation plan is not necessary to be provided at this point, the DEIR should at least propose conceptual ideas, including type of replacement habitat and potential receiver sites so that an assessment regarding adequacy and feasibility of mitigation measures can be made.
16. Page III.F-49: This paragraph states that *indirect* cumulative biological impacts would be less than significant, but does not state whether *direct* cumulative impacts to biological resources would be significant. It appears that this would be a significant impact. This discussion needs to be expanded accordingly.
17. Page III.F-46, Mitigation Measure F-5: Please refer to Comment #2 regarding open space. These comments should also be reflected in the mitigation measure.
18. Page III.F-47, Mitigation Measure F-8(2): The street lighting is not necessary or appropriate, given the site's location amidst sensitive ecological areas and the semi-rural character of the location. The mitigation measure should be revised to avoid street lighting that would adversely affect biological resources.

### **Section III.I VISUAL QUALITIES**

19. Starting on page III.1-32, the DEIR describes the project's aesthetic impacts, with mitigation measures beginning on page III.1-34. The DEIR concludes that impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings, would result in unavoidable significant impacts. However, the mitigation measures listed are inadequate, and do not even address some of the particular impact areas. Additional mitigation measures should be considered in this DEIR. While they may not eliminate the stated unavoidable significant impacts, they would serve to further reduce

impacts. The suggested mitigation measures, and/or changes to the project are described below.

20. As designed, the character of the project is more suburban than semi-rural. A community with street lights, sidewalks, curb and gutter is not the appropriate type of development in this area, which is semi-rural and surrounded by valuable natural areas and mountains, much of which has been designated as SEA. It is not clear if the development would be gated; gated communities should be discouraged in this area. While the compact layout of the development has notable benefits, namely concentrating urban development in a distinct area, thereby leaving more areas for open space, it also has significant drawbacks. In this particular case, the development is too urban in appearance. To be more compatible with the surrounding natural environment, consideration should be given to reducing the number of residential lots and redesigning the site, including re-configuration of the lots and street system to be more naturalistic. Examples include the following: no curb/sidewalk; no street lights or at least no light poles, the use of flag lots instead of cul-de-sac layouts; and more split level pads.
21. Page III.1-33, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the text states, "...grading would transform the complex terrain of the hillsides into more regular ordered patterns of horizontal planes. The rugged natural forms of the project site and the surrounding Santa Monica Mountains constitute major scenic resources." The project involves substantial cut (498,421 c.y.) and fill (427,483 c.y.) quantities, along with steep cut slopes. The amount of grading could feasibly be minimized by reducing the project footprint, especially encroaching into the hillsides. The proposed lots on the steeper slopes should be avoided, and instead these slopes should be preserved in their current state. On gentler slopes, the lots should be developed such that residences can be "stepped up" or terraced, being contoured with the hillside, not graded out to create flat building pads. This would result in development that is less visually intrusive to the hillside backdrop, and would greatly minimize aesthetic impacts to the scenic mountain resources.
22. Page III.1-33, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph: The text states that, "...the residential enclaves have been designed to create a suburban and semi-rural residential community that avoids the appearance of a 'tract' development." However, the development as proposed still conveys a sense of a suburban subdivision, as evidenced in the series of photo-simulation exhibits (III.1-7 through III.1-11). Further measures should be incorporated into the project to reduce this effect. In particular, building setbacks from Kanan and Cornell Roads should be increased, and the setbacks vegetated with denser landscaping (including trees and shrubs) that provides an adequate visual buffer from the homes to Kanan and Cornell Roads, and that reflects a more natural, as opposed to a manicured, appearance. As shown in the photo-simulations, the proposed vegetation is sporadically placed and insufficient. The landscaping should significantly obscure the buildings from vehicles and passersby on the main roadways through the area. The DEIR should describe the range of vegetative species to be used in the buffer areas and plot these areas on

an exhibit. Also, particular design characteristics, color schemes and building materials should be stipulated in the DEIR as mitigation measures. Page III.I-14, first full paragraph, states that, "...the depiction of the proposed structures is only intended to give the sense of their appearance. No architectural plans have been developed for the proposed homes; therefore, depictions of the homes are strictly generic and are not intended to suggest any specific architectural styles, color schemes or exterior building materials." While it is understandable and acceptable that the design is schematic at this point in time, the design characteristics are actually critical to considering whether the project would result in significant aesthetic impacts. Therefore, the project should either incorporate certain basic design standards/parameters to reduce potential impacts, or the standards should be included as mitigation measures. The design standards could include requiring earth-tone palettes; utilizing non-reflective and more naturalistic building materials; architecture that reflects but does not retract from the natural semi-rural surroundings through size, height, scale and style; and landscaping design that is naturalistic in placement and in types of species selected to blend in with the existing landscape. As presented, the mitigation measures do not go far enough in reducing the impacts. There are further feasible mitigation measures, such as those listed above, that should be included in the DEIR.

23. MM I-4 on page III.1-35 notes that concrete drains and all other drainage devices shall be tinted with an earth tone. This would help in minimizing aesthetic impacts. However, rather than just conceal the concrete and other man-made structures through tints, consideration should be given to minimizing the amount and size of man-made drainage structures to what is absolutely necessary. For example, where possible, natural or natural-appearing materials, such as riprap, should be utilized. As presented, the mitigation measure is insufficient, and additional feasible measures should be listed in the DEIR.
24. Page III.I-34, Mitigation Measure I-1(1): The third sentence should be revised to state, "Only non-invasive, native plant...." Not "non-native."

### **Section III. J LIGHT AND GLARE**

25. Aside from the fact that County standards may require street lighting, the need for light poles is not made clear in the DEIR. How many street lights would be required to meet County standards and how tall would the light standards be? Could not other types of lighting, besides poles, provide adequate safety? Additionally, page III.J-3, footnote 2, states that street lighting systems may be waived if the "advisory agency finds that street lights will not be in keeping with the neighborhood pattern." Given the substantial impacts of street lighting on the general area, the DEIR needs to provide further information on the need for such lighting and consider alternative methods of providing illumination. While there is already some street pole lighting in the general area, the proposed project would substantially add to this lighting, creating further inconsistencies with the semi-rural character.

26. Page III.J-7 notes that passengers in vehicles on Kanan Road would experience substantial new light or glare impacts at a level that is less than significant. Also, the last paragraph on this page states that the development "would not create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect nighttime views as seen from Cornell Road." This conclusion is not adequately substantiated, so further information needs to be provided to support these statements. The project would significantly add to the existing Kanan Road lighting and create new lighting along Cornell Road. A photometric study or similar lighting evaluation should be prepared that demonstrates the specific areas that would be illuminated and at what levels.
27. Page III.J-9, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: The conclusion that project lighting would not make any material contribution to the already-present sky glow needs to be substantiated.
28. Page III.J-10, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: The conclusion of no significant impact to light-sensitive wildlife species also needs to be substantiated. Just because the majority of the site area will remain in open space does not mean that lighting in the remainder of the site would not result in significant impacts.
29. The mitigation measures listed on page III.J-13 in bullet format are beneficial but do not go far enough in reducing impacts. The DEIR should consider other feasible measures, such as eliminating street lighting.

### **Section III.K LAND USE COMPATIBILITY**

30. The North Area Plan (NAP) consistency analysis in this section, summarized as Table III.K-1, should be completely re-assessed. In many cases, the DEIR notes that the project is in "conformance" or "substantial conformance" when in actuality, the discussion of the project in other sections of the DEIR is inconsistent with these conclusions, and the evidence of consistency provided in the table is incorrect or inadequate. The following are just a few examples, but we recommend that the entire Table III.K-1 be reconsidered.
  - A. Page III.K-13, Policy IV-3c: The conclusion should be "inconsistent," as the DEIR has not shown that impacts to sensitive habitat (including wetlands) are unavoidable.
  - B. Page III.K-14, Policy IV-3d: The biological section of the DEIR does not indicate that direct impacts to *Lyon's pentachaeta* have been avoided. This needs to be corrected.
  - C. Page III.K-15, Policies IV-9 and IV-10: Given the substantial amount of hillside grading, especially on steep slopes (over 60 feet), the conclusions here should be "inconsistent."



- D. Page III.1-33, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the text states, "...grading would transform the complex terrain of the hillsides into more regular ordered patterns of horizontal planes. Therefore, the conclusion of "conformance" of the project with NAP Policy IV-10 found on page III.K-15 appears incorrect, as does the conclusion of "substantial conformance" for Policy IV-32 on page III.K-19.
- E. Page III.K-29, NAP Policy 13: The "substantial conformance" conclusion is not supported. The project could incorporate many more features to contribute to the rural character and lifestyle, such as reducing lighting, creating a less urban street development, and reducing the amount of hillside grading.
- F. Page III.K-39, the conclusion that the project is consistent with SEA Criterion 3 is not supported by the DEIR (see Comment #13).
31. Page III.K-43, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: The DEIR states that project impacts with regard to conflicts with applicable policies and plans would be significant. We agree with this conclusion. However, page III.K-44 notes that no mitigation measures are required for this impact. Moreover, page III.K-45, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, states, "As previously discussed, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, regulation..." Therefore, the DEIR provides conflicting information regarding whether policy consistency impacts would be significant. The DEIR should address this inconsistency, and address how this significant impact would be mitigated. Feasible mitigation measures would be to adjust the project to be consistent with the appropriate policies and regulations.
32. Page III.K-16, Policy IV-13: The conclusion should be "inconsistent," given the fact that there would be substantial grading of the site, with "regular ordered patterns of horizontal planes." As proposed, the project also has inadequate landscaping buffers and setbacks from the major roadways (see Comment #22).
33. Page III.K-39, SEA Compatibility Criterion 3: Please refer to Comment #13.
34. Given the numerous policy inconsistencies (NAP and SEA), the project as currently proposed seems inappropriate for the site. The project should be re-considered, with a less damaging alternative in terms of biological and hillside resources selected, such as Alternative 4, as discussed below.

### **Section III.L TRAFFIC AND ACCESS**

35. This section should analyze potential impacts to the roadway system from construction-related activities, such as truck trips.

36. This section should also assess haul routes, and analyze potential impacts on the roadway system, including the Kanan Road/Highway 101 interchange. Approval of haul routes is required by the City.
37. The last sentence on page III.1-27 states that the proposed project would participate in a Traffic Impact Fee program on a per-PM-trip basis through the City of Agoura Hills Benefit Assessment Fee. Please note that the City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) would total \$197,640, based upon the construction of 81 homes at a rate of \$2,440 per home. This contribution should be referenced in the discussion of mitigation measures.
38. The DEIR should clarify that the project would be required to continue the proposed full width street improvements for the ultimate buildout of Kanan Road northerly to approximately 100 feet north of Cornell Way to provide a proper transition, including improvements to the Cornell Way intersection. The design and construction would need to be reviewed and approved by the City within the City limits. The costs for these improvements within the City are creditable against the TIF.

#### **Section III.M.5 PUBLIC SERVICES – PARKS AND RECREATION**

39. Pages III.M.5-4 and -5 note that the project would be required to pay a Quimby fee to Los Angeles County to offset increased demand on parks and recreational facilities. However, the text goes on to say that project residents would likely utilize parks and recreational facilities in the City of Agoura Hills, and therefore the proposed project's impacts on parks and recreational facilities in the City would be significant. Also, on page III.M.5-6 of the cumulative impact discussion, the text notes that cumulative impacts to recreational facilities in the City of Agoura Hills would be significant." Under the discussion of "MITIGATION MEASURES," the DEIR concludes that payment of the Quimby fee to the County would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. In actuality, payment of such fees to the County would not reduce the impact to less than significant, since these fees would not be used to augment existing or create new park and recreation facilities in the City, where the DEIR notes the impacts would be received. This paragraph concludes that "With the provision of these new County facilities, the proposed project's impacts on City of Agoura Hills parks and recreation facilities would be temporary and less than significant." What is problematic with this conclusion is that the DEIR does not describe these County facilities. Without specific park and recreational facilities in the planning stages, this mitigation measure may not be implemented. The "temporary" impact to Agoura Hills may in reality be more permanent. An adequate mitigation measure needs to be identified in the DEIR. Therefore, the City requests that an equitable portion of the Quimby fee for the project be provided to the City. Another way in which the significant impacts to the City can feasibly be mitigated is for the project to dedicate additional funds, separate from the Quimby fee, to

the City as compensation for the greater demand for parks and recreation that would need to be met by Agoura Hills.

#### Section V. ALTERNATIVES

40. As noted in the document, particularly in Table V-3, Alternative 4 (SEA/Reduced Lot Plan) is the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative addresses many of the concerns listed throughout this letter, and so is the preferred alternative of the City of Agoura Hills. On page V-43, the text notes that Alternative 4 would not satisfy all of the project objectives since it would not achieve the project applicant's basic goal of developing 81 homes. This objective is explained further on page V-3. However, could not the applicant's goal of creating a marketable and financially feasible project (hence, the 81 units assumed by the developer) still be achieved with less homes? We suggest that further consideration be given to this alternative and its ability to meet the objective of economic feasibility.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this DEIR for the Triangle Ranch Project. The City of Agoura Hills looks forward to reviewing the responses to our comments. If you have any questions, please contact Allison Cook, Senior Planner, of my staff at (818) 597-7310.

Sincerely,



Mike Kamino  
Planning and Community Development Director

Attachment: Updated Project List for City of Agoura Hills

Cc: Greg Ramirez, City Manager  
Jim Thorsen, Assistant City Manager

Table 1

## Cumulative Development Summary with Agoura Village Proposal

Project Proponent/Name	Land Use	Size	Status
Ball Propertied (Centerpointe)	Office	61,040 SF	Approved/Under Construction
J.H. Snyder Co	Office	40,000 SF	Approved/Under Construction
	Restaurant	19,000 SF	
	Apartments	336 DU	
Adobe Cantina	Restaurant	1,142 SF Add.	Under Review
Palo Camado Ranch	Single Family	8 DU	Approved/Construction Pending
Burgundy Creek Bistro			See Agoura Village
Cornerstone			
See Agoura Village			
Chabad of the Conejo	Classrooms/Office for Church	6,442 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
Silagi-Canwood Corporate Center	General Office	22,896 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Temple Beth Haverim	Synagogue	31,000 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
Scheu Development	General Office	81,000 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
LA County Fire Department Sta.#89	Fire Station/Training Facility	12,500 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Schneider	Condominium	4 DU	Approved/Construction Pending
Silagi Development	General Office	49,350 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Ted Moore			See Agoura Village
Agoura Business Center	Warehouse/Manufacturing/Office	19,810 SF	Under Review
Development Partners	General Office	31,160 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Adler Realty	Furniture Stores	118,162 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Levy, Moshe	General Office	20,830 SF	Approved/Complete
Wickman-Agoura Furniture Center	Furniture Store	38,760 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Del Rahim	Auto Detailing Service	10,333 SF	Approved/Under Construction
Minder	Condominium	19 DU	Approved/Under Construction
Reyes Adobe Partners, L.P.	Furniture Store	14,500 SF	Approved/Complete
Leader Carpets	Retail	14,080 SF	Approved/Complete
So. Cal. Food Services for Wendy's	Drive-Thru Fast Food	3,200 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
Realty Bancorp Equities	Commercial	76,750 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
Stockton for Levy	Furniture Store	10,000 SF	Approved/Under Construction
	General Office	6,700 SF	
Symphony Project			See Agoura Village
Alesco Development	Office	63208 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
BBA Properties LLC for Michael Browers	Office	9,000 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
Zaghi	Warehouse/Manufacturing	11,636 SF	Approved/Construction Pending
HBF Holdings	Hotel/Homewood Suites	125 Rooms	Approved/Construction Pending
Heathcote for Buckley	Commercial/Medical	14,075 SF	Under Review
Stockton	Apartments	4 DU	Approved/Construction Pending
Chesebro Properties, LLC	Office	8,000 SF	Approved/Complete
Riopharm	Single Family	28 DU	Under Review
Agoura Village A - South	Retail/Office	119,000 SF	Under Review
	Townhomes	62 DU	
	Apartments	56 DU	
Agoura Village A - North	Retail/Office	29,308 SF	Under Review
	Apartments	19 DU	
Agoura Village B	Retail/Office/Restaurant	122,000 SF	Under Review
	Townhomes	81 DU	
	Apartments	19 DU	
Agoura Village C	Retail/Office/Restaurant	3,500 SF	Under Review
Agoura Village D - West	Retail/Office/Restaurant	36,600 SF	Under Review
Agoura Village D - East	Retail/Office/Restaurant	113,300 SF	Under Review
Agoura Village E	Retail/Office/Restaurant	77,000 SF	Under Review
	Townhomes	25 DU	
	Apartments	19 DU	
Agoura Village F	Office	75,250 SF	Under Review