

# REVISED PROJECT DESIGN – 71 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES

**Triangle Ranch**  
**Vesting Tentative Tract No. 52419**  
**Los Angeles County Project No. 97-178**  
**State Clearinghouse No. 1998111091**

## **Introduction**

The project has been revised in response to issues raised by the public, Department of Regional Planning staff and the Planning Commission concerning the previously proposed 81-lot site plan (assessed in the Draft EIR, March 2005). In particular, concerns were expressed regarding: (1) impacts to SEA No. 6 (e.g., fragmentation of habitat, alteration of watercourses and elimination of Lyon's pentachaeta and Santa Monica Mountains dudleya plant populations); (2) visual quality impacts along Kanan Road, identified as a "particularly significant scenic route" by the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan; and 3) perceived inconsistencies with some of the goals and policies of the North Area Plan. In addition, staff expressed concerns that the previously proposed project did not meet the burdens of proof required for hillside management, SEA and North Area Plan grading conditional use permits.

## **Site Plan**

The revised project design is a 71-lot site plan that proposes to develop 10 fewer lots than the previously proposed project. On the west side of Kanan Road, the revised project would develop 47 single-family homes in two enclaves: in the northern enclave there would be 35 homes and in the southern there would be 12 homes. In comparison the previously proposed project would have developed a total of 44 homes in one enclave in the northern portion of the project site, but it extended south along Kanan Road and terminated in a cul-de-sac. The revised project would develop two enclaves separated by a largely undisturbed secondary ridge. Each of these two enclaves would have a single means of access directly from Kanan Road.

Between Kanan and Cornell Roads (in the northern portion of the project site), the revised project would develop 10 homes. This is the same number and the same design as was the previously proposed project.

The revised project design would develop 14 homes on the east side of Cornell Road (within SEA No. 6). Compared to the previously proposed project, the revised project reduces impacts within SEA No. 6 by reducing the number of residences by 13 homes; by moving the ingress roadway to the north of the fire station; by removing all development from the vicinity of Drainage "M"; by avoiding the largest populations of Lyon's pentachaeta on the project site; by clustering all homes in proximity to Cornell

Road; and by eliminating the eastern extension of the Street "E" cul-de-sac and the eastern most lots. The site plan for the revised project design is presented in Exhibit 1. A summary comparison of the proposed housing with the original design is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**Summary Comparison of Housing**

	Revised Project Design	Previously Proposed Project
<b>West Side of Kanan</b>	47 Lots Total	44 Lots Total
<b>Northern Enclave</b>	35 Lots	44 Lots
<b>Southern Enclave</b>	12 Lots	N/A
<b>Between Kanan and Cornell</b>	10 Lots	10 Lots
<b>East Side of Cornell</b>	14 Lots	27 Lots
<b>Total</b>	71 Lots	81 Lots

Table 2 provides a summary comparison of proposed lot sizes.

**Table 2**  
**Summary Comparison of Lot Sizes**

	Revised Project Design		Previously Proposed Project	
	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum
<b>West Side of Cornell Road</b>	27,835 Square Feet	10,018 Square Feet	33,977 Square Feet	10,020 Square Feet
<b>East Side of Cornell Road</b>	47,306 Square Feet	18,513 Square Feet	70,654 Square Feet	21,858 Square Feet

**Exhibit 1, Revised Project Site Plan**

The revised project is an amalgamation of design features derived from the previously proposed project and/or from the alternatives assessed in Section V of the Draft EIR. For example, the two residential enclaves on the west side of Kanan Road are essentially the same as in Alternative 5; the enclave between Kanan and Cornell Roads is the same as in the previously proposed project. The clustering of homes on the east side of Cornell Road is a combination of Alternative 4 and the previously proposed project. From Alternative 4, the revised project also incorporates the design concept that reduces impacts to SEA No. 6. This is achieved by reducing the number of homes within the SEA, clustering the remaining homes in the least sensitive area of the SEA adjacent to Cornell Road, providing greater development setbacks from the watercourses, and eliminating the long cul-de-sac that contributed to habitat fragmentation. From Alternative 5, the revised project incorporates the design concept that avoids direct impacts to the remaining onsite populations of sensitive plant species, outside the boundaries of the SEA, by retaining those sensitive plant species populations within proposed open space lots.

### **Grading**

Besides reducing the total number of proposed homes on the project site by 10 units, the revised project design also achieves further reductions in the total area of the grading footprint, the total quantity of earthwork, and the extent of fuel modification. For the most part, the grading footprint for the revised project design fits within the grading footprint of the previously proposed project. Where exceptions occur, the revised project design fits within the grading footprints of one of the alternatives assessed in Section V. of the Draft EIR. In particular, under the revised project design, housing on the west side of Kanan Road would extend approximately 625 feet farther south than under the previously proposed project. This grading scheme is the same as evaluated under Alternative 5 in the Draft EIR.

The grading footprint of the revised project design covers an area of approximately 38.58 acres. This is approximately ten acres less than the grading footprint of the previously proposed project, primarily as a result of the fewer lots east of Cornell Road. The total quantity of earthwork under the revised project design is approximately 407,100 cubic yards of excavation. This is approximately 91,320 cubic yards of excavation less than required by the previously proposed project. Table 3 provides a summary comparison of the grading footprints and earthwork quantities under the revised project and the previously proposed project.

**Table 3**  
**Revised Project Design – Comparative Landform/Grading**

<b>Project</b>	<b>East Side of Cornell Road</b>	<b>West Side of Kanan Rd.</b>	<b>Between Kanan and Cornell Roads</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Revised Project Design</b>				
Area of Landform Alternation	13.14 acres	21.25 acres	4.2 acres	38.58 acres
<b>Cubic Yardage of Earthwork</b>				
Cut	185,000 cubic yards of cut	154,669 cubic yards	67,437 cubic yards of cut	407,100 cubic yards of cut
Fill	84,000 cubic yards of fill	305,700 cubic yards of fill	No fill	389,700 cubic yards of fill
<b>Previously Proposed Project</b>				
Area of Landform Alternation	22.88 acres	21.54 acres	4.2 acres	48.6 acres
<b>Cubic Yardage of Earthwork</b>				
Cut	243,943 cubic yards of cut	187,041 cubic yards of cut	67,437 cubic yards of cut	498,421 cubic yards of cut
Fill	251,065 cubic yards of fill	167,183 cubic yards of fill	3,235 cubic yards of fill	427,483 cubic yards of fill
* <i>Note: These are rough calculations based upon the preliminary grading plan. They do not take into consideration such factors as shrinkage and fine tuning adjustments of the final grading plan. As discussed in the Draft EIR, grading is expected to balance onsite.</i>				

**Building Pad Elevations**

The elevation of the proposed homes above the grade of Kanan and Cornell Roads was also an issue raised with the previously proposed project. Some expressed concern that the raised elevations made the homes more prominently visible while, at the same time, tended to block the scenic vistas from the adjacent highways. In response, the revised project has been designed to lower the grades of the proposed homes. On the west side of Kanan Road, building pad elevations range from 844 to 892 feet above mean sea level (ASL). In comparison, building pad elevations in the same area under the previously proposed project ranged from 849 to 915 feet ASL. Hence, the revised project design lowers building elevations on the west side of Kanan Road by 5 to 23 feet. On the east side of Cornell Road,

building pad elevations under the revised project range from 860 to 937 feet ASL. In comparison, building pad elevations on the east side of Cornell Road under the previously proposed project ranged from 866 to 948 feet ASL. Hence, the revised project lowers building elevations on the east side of Cornell Road by 6 to 11 feet. Table 4 provides a summary comparison of building pad elevations.

**Table 4**  
**Summary Comparison of Building Pad Elevations**

	Revised Project Design		Previously Proposed Project	
	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum
West Side of Kanan Road	892 ASL	844 ASL	915 ASL	849 ASL
East Side of Cornell Road	937 ASL	860 ASL	948 ASL	866 ASL

#### **Retaining/Crib Walls**

The height of retaining walls was another issue raised with the previously proposed project. The revised project has been designed to reduce the heights of the walls. Under the revised project, maximum height of walls on the west side of Kanan Road has been reduced from 19 feet to 10 feet. The one exception is the wall on the north side of Lots 1-4. Because the grading plan for this area has not change, this crib wall has been retained as originally designed in the previously proposed project: maximum height of 17 feet and a length of 320 feet. However, this wall would be minimally visible due to its perpendicular orientation to Kanan Road. On the east side of Cornell Road, the maximum height of a retaining wall (behind Lot 62) has been reduced to eight (8) feet. In comparison, under the previously proposed project, the maximum height of a retaining wall on the east side of Cornell Road would have been 28 feet.

#### **Cut and Fill Slopes**

The height of cut and fill slopes was also an issue raised with the previously proposed project. The revised project has been designed to reduce both cut and fill slopes. Under the previously proposed project, the tallest cut slope was located in the eastern portion of the project site. It reached a maximum height of approximately 70 feet. Under the revised project, the maximum height of a cut slope (which is above Lot 71) has been reduced to 52.5 feet. This cut slope is in the same general area as the previous 70 cut slope. In the same general area, the tallest fill slope under the previously proposed project was approximately 65 feet. The tallest fill slope under the revised project (below Lot 63) has a maximum height of 40 feet. This fill slope is also in the same general area as the previous 65 foot slope.

---

---

## **Potential Environmental Impacts**

The following discussion addresses each potential environmental impact category assessed in the Draft EIR. The revised project is compared to the previously proposed project and the level of impact associated with the revised project is identified.

### ***Geotechnical Hazards - Grading***

As previously discussed, the revised project design would disturb approximately 38.58 acres through grading operations. This is approximately ten fewer acres of grading than the 48.6 acres of grading under the previously proposed project. No offsite grading would be required for the revised project design. With respect to earthwork quantities, the revised project would involve the excavation of 407,100 cubic yards and the fill emplacement of 389,700 cubic yards. This total is 91,321 (or approximately 18%) fewer cubic yards of excavation and fill than would have been required for the previously proposed project.

The grading quantities are inclusive of roughly calculated volumes for cut and fill, with adjustments made for shrinkage and remedial over-excavation and recompaction of artificial fill, alluvium and colluvium materials and assumes filling some minor areas along Kanan Road. The volume of cut includes approximately 160,000 cubic yards of remedial removals and recompaction of uncompacted fills and unsatisfactory alluvial and colluvium materials.

Because the homes to be developed under the revised project design would be located in the same general areas as those in the previously proposed project, they would be exposed to the same general geotechnical conditions as identified for the previously proposed project. Similar to the previously proposed project, it is anticipated that the revised project could result in significant impacts due to the potential for boulder roll and debris flow. However, implementation of the originally recommended mitigation measures (see Draft EIR, Section III.A, Geotechnical Hazards – Grading; pages III.A-16 to III.A-18) would reduce the previously proposed project's potentially significant impacts from geotechnical hazards to less-than-significant levels. Geotechnical hazard impacts under the revised project design would be comparable to those associated with the previously proposed project and would also be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the same mitigation measures.

### ***Seismicity***

Residences developed under the revised project design would be subject to the same strong ground shaking during an earthquake as the previously proposed project. However, as the revised project design would

construct 10 fewer residences on the project site than the previously proposed project, fewer people would be exposed to seismic hazards. Seismic hazards for the revised project would be mitigated (see Draft EIR, Section III.B, Seismicity, page III.B-7) to a less-than-significant level.

### *Air Quality*

Approximately the same amount of land surface would be graded on a daily basis under both the revised project design and the previously proposed project. Therefore, on a daily basis, short-term construction vehicle emission impacts would be approximately the same for both projects. PM-10 emissions for both the previously proposed project and revised project design would be less than significant. Potentially significant ROG emissions for both the previously proposed project and revised project design could be mitigated to less than significant levels. Under both the revised project design and the previously proposed project, NOx emissions from construction equipment would exceed the SCAQMD's threshold criteria. Therefore, both the revised project design and the previously proposed project would create significant short-term air quality impacts. However, due to the slightly smaller area of landform disturbance (approximately 10 acres of disturbance less than the previously proposed project), the revised project design would slightly decrease the length of the grading phase, resulting in slightly fewer (approximately 12% fewer) total construction vehicle emissions.

Because operational air quality impacts derive almost entirely from vehicle emissions and, because the revised project design would generate approximately 105 daily vehicle trips less than the previously proposed project, the revised project design would be expected to generate approximately 12 percent less vehicle emissions than the previously proposed project. Thus, the revised project design would further reduce the less-than-significant air quality impacts from operational vehicle emissions associated with the previously proposed project.

### *Hydrology/Flood Hazard*

The revised project design would employ a comparable storm water drainage concept as the previously proposed project. Storm drainage improvements would include on-site storm drains sized to convey "bulked" storm runoff flows through the development area for discharge into Medea Creek. Also, both the previously proposed project and the revised project design would provide a comparably sized debris basin in the northwestern portion of the project site. Because there is very little storm water infiltration that occurs on the undeveloped site, the developed conditions for the previously proposed project do not result in a material increase in site runoff. This is also the case with the revised project design, which would not increase site runoff rates. Therefore, peak runoff during a 50-year storm from the previously proposed project and revised project would be essentially the same and would not change the runoff rate compared to the "undeveloped" site conditions. Neither the revised project design nor the previously



proposed project would cause increased downstream flooding.

Because the conversion of naturally vegetated hillsides to residential uses removes the debris production potential from the development area, the larger the development area the more debris reduction is achieved. While both the revised project design and the previously proposed project would result in less downstream debris deposition than occurs under existing undeveloped conditions, the previously proposed project would achieve a greater reduction in debris deposition than the revised project design. The previously proposed project, in combination with the mitigation measures (see Draft EIR, Section III.D, Surface Water Runoff/Hydrology, pages III.D-16 to III.D-17), is sufficient to reduce runoff-related impacts to a less than significant level. Following implementation of the same mitigation, the storm water runoff/hydrology impacts from revised project design would similarly be reduced to a less than significant level.

### ***Water Quality***

The revised project design would utilize essentially the same strategies for preventing short-term construction-related water quality impacts as the previously proposed project: compliance with the NPDES requirements, including implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. These strategies would reduce short-term construction-related water quality impacts to less than significant levels for both the previously proposed project and the revised project design.

With ten fewer residences provided on the project site, there would be approximately 12 percent fewer vehicles on the project site under the revised project. Consequently, the vehicles of the revised project design would incidentally release approximately 12 percent less hydrocarbon pollutants onto paved surfaces within the project site than the previously proposed project. Also, the revised project design would use approximately 12 percent less exterior chemical applications such as fertilizers and pesticides as the previously proposed project. Neither the revised project design nor the previously proposed project include horse keeping as a major development feature. Therefore, overall the revised project design would reduce water quality impacts by approximately 12 percent, compared to the previously proposed project.

The revised project design and the previously proposed project would use the same mechanical clarifier systems to comply with the Los Angeles County Urban Storm Water Runoff Mitigation Plan, where “first flush” cleansing of storm water runoff would be achieved. As discussed in the Draft EIR, Section III.E, compliance with local, state and federal water quality control programs would reduce the previously proposed project’s water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Similar compliance by the revised project design would result in comparable less-than-significant impacts.

### ***Biological Resources***

The revised project design would reduce grading impacts within the SEA No. 6 by 9.7 acres, from 22.88 acres of disturbance under the previously proposed project to 13.14 acres. The design of the revised project adequately addresses the six established SEA compatibility criteria implemented by the County similar to the previously proposed project except that the revised project design avoids direct impacts to drainage "M". As required by SEA compatibility criteria: the revised project design still fragments habitat with impacts to sensitive biotic resources but to a lesser extent than the previously proposed project by reducing the amount of grading impacts in the SEA area, and by clustering dwelling units in proximity to Cornell Road; it reduces the impact to watercourses and tributaries that supply Medea Creek; it preserves the existing wildlife movement pathways within the project site, including within the SEA; it increases the amount of vegetative buffers used to protect critical resource areas, and reduces impacts to the endangered Lyon's pentachaeta and Santa Monica Mountains Dudleya (which is not located in the SEA 6 on the project site); it utilizes fences or walls as a supplementary buffer between development and natural habitat; and the revised project design reduces the conflict between project infrastructure and critical resources, by placing utilities underground and reducing the impact from proposed interior streets.

Impacts to sensitive or endangered species are lessened by the design of the revised project:

- *Lyon's pentachaeta*: The revised project design would reduce impacts to Lyon's pentachaeta by approximately 50%, compared to the previously proposed project. Direct impacts would affect 0.36 acres of Lyon's pentachaeta habitat and, potential indirect impacts from fuel modification could affect an additional area of 0.41 acres. In total, the combined direct impacts and potential indirect impacts would result in impacts to 0.77 acres. In contrast, the previously proposed project would impact a total area of 1.55 of Lyon's pentachaeta habitat (including direct and indirect impact).
- *Santa Monica Mountains dudleya*: The revised project design would eliminate direct grading impacts to Santa Monica Mountains dudleya habitat by preserving the ridgeline where the habitat is located. The preserved ridgeline is the one that separates the two residential enclaves on the west side of Kanan Road. The previously proposed project would have graded a roadway over the ridge, thus eliminating the dudleya habitat. It is possible that some indirect impacts to the dudleya habitat (approximately 0.23 acres) may still occur due to fuel modification requirements with the revised project design.
- *Oak trees*: The revised project design would reduce impacts to oak trees, compared to the previously proposed project. The revised project design would remove 16 oaks and would encroach upon an additional 2 trees. In contrast, the previously proposed project would have removed 18 oaks and encroached upon an additional 17 trees.

The revised project design would reduce the area of native habitat affected by fuel modification

requirements by approximately 11%. Under the revised project design, approximately 21.73 acres within the project site and up to 2.3 acres offsite would be subject to fuel modification. In comparison, the previously proposed project would have resulted in 24.7 acres of fuel modification within the project site and up to 2.3 acres offsite. Thus, the revised project design would reduce fuel modification impacts on approximately 3 acres.

There are no direct impacts to Medea Creek associated with either the previously proposed project or the revised project design. Furthermore, the revised project design eliminates impacts to Drainages M and D (and D's tributaries) within the SEA.

### *Cultural Resources*

The revised project design would impact the same archaeological remains as the previously proposed project; therefore, its impacts to Cultural Resources would be the same as those associated with the previously proposed project. The Phase II test excavations and surface collections have served to completely and adequately mitigate all adverse impacts that might accrue to seven of the eight archaeological sites on the project site. The remaining site, CA-LAN-2078 would be preserved in an open space lot.

### *Noise*

Construction noise levels under the revised project design would be essentially the same as those associated with the previously proposed project. Because construction would take place in essentially the same locations as in the previously proposed project, the same existing residences would experience the same short-term construction noise impacts. However, because there would be 10 fewer homes and 10 fewer acres of grading, the revised project design would decrease the overall length of time nearby existing residences would be exposed to construction noise. The revised project design would generate less (i.e., 105 daily trips) vehicular traffic than the previously proposed project. Consequently, the revised project design would be expected to reduce further the less-than-significant traffic noise produced by the previously proposed project.

### *Visual Qualities*

The revised project design would reduce visual quality impacts. This is achieved by: reduction of the total number of homes on the project site from 81 to 71; reduction of landform alteration due to grading by approximately 10 acres; reduction of fuel modification by approximately three acres; reduction of building pad heights by a range from five to 23 feet, depending on location; reduction of retaining wall heights from

a maximum of 28 feet to walls of no more than 10 feet<sup>1</sup>; reduction of cut slopes from 70 feet to a maximum height of 53 feet; and, reduction of fill slopes from 65 feet to a maximum of 40 feet.

The retention of the secondary ridgeline in the central portion of the project site, on the west side of Kanan Road, would break up the “massing” of homes in that area and would help to create the appearance of a smaller project. On the other hand, the provision of two enclaves on the west side of Kanan Road extends development farther south than in the previously proposed project.

The enclave located between Kanan and Cornell Roads would be essentially the same as in the previously proposed project. Thus, there would be no substantial changes in visual qualities in this portion of the project site.

The previously proposed project would have provided a custom site design on the east side of Cornell Road, characterized by curvilinear roads and large dispersed lots. In contrast, the revised project design clusters all the homes in close proximity to Cornell Road. Residences under revised project design would not extend as far southeast into the SEA as they would under the previously proposed project. Therefore, the revised project design would exchange visual impacts somewhat diffused by distance from Cornell Road (under the previously proposed project) for a smaller area of more obvious impacts along Cornell Road.

### *Light and Glare*

The revised project design would create slightly fewer sources of residential night lighting on the project site, since it would provide ten fewer residences than the previously proposed project. However, new sources of lighting would be distributed over a wider area and closer to west side of Kanan Road in the southern portion of the project site and closer to the east side of Cornell Road. Both the previously proposed project and the revised project design would mitigate night lighting impacts to less-than-significant levels. With ten fewer homes on the project site, the revised project design would reduce lighting sources; however, this slight reduction in lighting effects would be accompanied by the placement of the remaining residences closer to Kanan and Cornell Roads.

### *Land Use Compatibility*

The revised project design would be consistent with the land use density permitted by the Los Angeles

---

<sup>1</sup> The one exception is the wall on the north side of Lots 1-4. Because the grading plan for this area has not change, this crib wall has been retained as originally designed in the previously proposed project: maximum height of 17 feet and a length of 320 feet.

County General Plan, the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, and existing zoning. Similar to the previously proposed project, the revised project design would also cluster development into residential enclaves which is encouraged by the SMMNAP. Furthermore, the revised project design would decrease impacts to biological resources within SEA No. 6. The revised project design would not physically divide an established community. Also, because of its reduced density, the revised project design is more compatible in land use and density with the existing pattern of residential development adjacent to the project site (i.e., along Cornell and Silver Creek Roads), and further to the south than the previously proposed project. Lastly, the revised project design is considered to be more in conformance with the goals and policies of the SMMNAP policies and with the General Plan SEA compatibility criteria than the previously proposed project.

### ***Traffic and Access***

The Draft EIR estimates average traffic generation to be 10.54 vehicles per day per residence. At 71 residences, the revised project design would generate approximately 748 vehicle trips per day. This is 106 vehicles trips (or 12 percent) less than the 854 daily vehicle trips estimated to be generated by the previously proposed project. Traffic impacts associated with the previously proposed project were determined to be less than significant. The revised project design would further reduce those less-than-significant impacts by 12 percent. The revised project design would also be required to pay a fair share of the necessary roadway improvements.

### ***Fire Protection Services***

The revised project design would be subject to the same fire hazards and would receive the same level of fire protection as the previously proposed project. The revised project design would provide ten fewer residences on the project site, and therefore would reduce demand for fire protection services. Nevertheless, both the revised project design and the previously proposed project would contribute to the need for new or physically altered Fire Department facilities; therefore, both would have potentially significant impacts on fire protection services, before mitigation. However, the revised project design would mitigate its impacts to less than significant levels through the payment of a Developer Fee on Construction (the current prevailing rate is \$0.3716 per square foot of construction).

### ***Sheriff's Services***

With ten fewer residences on the project site, the revised project design would reduce the demand for Sheriff's protective services, compared to the previously proposed project. Neither the revised project design nor the previously proposed project would result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered Sheriff's station or other facilities; therefore,

the impact on Sheriff's protective services under the revised project design would be less than significant.

### *Education*

With ten fewer residences on the project site, the revised project design would generate slightly fewer students, compared to the previously proposed project. The previously proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered schools in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Therefore, impacts on public schools associated with the revised project design, which would be less than those associated with the previously proposed project, would also be less than significant. Furthermore, the revised project design would mitigate school impacts by paying the maximum development fees permitted to be exacted under State law.

### *Libraries*

With ten fewer residences, the revised project design would reduce the demand for library services and facilities compared to the previously proposed project. The previously proposed project would mitigate its impact by payment of the Library Facilities Mitigation Fee and the revised project design would also be required to pay the Fee. Therefore, Library impacts from the revised project design would be less than significant.

### *Parks and Recreation*

The revised project design would reduce demand for parks and recreation facilities compared to the previously proposed project. The previously proposed project would mitigate its impact to County facilities by payment of the Quimby Fee; the revised project design would also be required to pay the Fee. With the required payment of Quimby fees to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, the revised project's impacts on parks and recreational facilities in the County of Los Angeles would be less than significant. The Subdivision Map Act, Government Code Section 66477(a)(3), requires the County of Los Angeles to use the Quimby fees to develop new neighborhood or community parks or recreational facilities to serve the subdivision.

### *Utilities – Water*

The revised project design would provide ten fewer residences on the project site compared to the

previously proposed project. Therefore, its demand for water and impacts associated with water service would be proportionately reduced (by approximately 12 percent). The previously proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; consequently, the revised project design impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, the previously proposed project would not result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the project site from existing entitlements and resources; consequently, revised project design impacts to water supplies would be less than significant

#### *Utilities – Sewage*

The revised project design would generate approximately 12 percent less sewage than the previously proposed project. The previously proposed project would not have required or resulted in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, nor resulted in a determination that there was not adequate capacity to serve the project's demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Therefore, previously proposed project impacts to the sewerage system would have been less than significant. The revised project design would further reduce the previously proposed project's less-than-significant sewage impacts.

#### *Utilities – Solid Waste*

The revised project design would generate approximately 12 percent less household solid waste than the previously proposed project. Solid waste generated by the previously proposed project would not exceed daily capacity of the Calabasas Landfill, and its impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, solid waste impacts under the revised project design would also be less than significant.

### *Electricity*

The revised project design would consume approximately 12 percent less electricity than the previously proposed project. The previously proposed project could have been served by Southern California Edison and, with the use of modern energy efficient construction materials and compliance with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations: California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, the previously proposed project would have been consistent with the State's energy conservation standards and therefore would not have conflicted with adopted energy conservation plans. Therefore, previously proposed project impacts to the electrical system would have been less than significant. Impacts under the revised project design would be further reduced by approximately 12 percent and would consequently be less than significant.

### *Natural Gas*

The revised project design would consume approximately 12 percent less natural gas than the previously proposed project. SCG has stated that it could have accommodated the natural gas needs of the previously proposed project. Furthermore, the previously proposed project would have been required to comply with the standards in Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations as they relate to the conservation of natural gas. Also, the previously proposed project would have been required to use modern energy-efficient construction materials and otherwise comply with the State's energy conservation standards. Therefore, the previously proposed project would not have conflicted with adopted energy conservation plans. Impacts associated with the revised project design would be approximately 12 percent less than those associated with the previously proposed project.

### **Conclusion**

On average, the revised project design would reduce quantifiable impacts by approximately 12% compared to the previously proposed project. The conclusions of significant impacts would be the same with the revised project design as for the previously proposed project, namely, biological resources, air quality, noise and visual resources would continue to be significant.