



# DECISION MAKING GUIDEBOOK

**Planning Commission**  
February 18, 2010

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**PART 1: BACKGROUND**

**PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE**

**PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

## **PART 1: BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this Decision Making Guidebook is to assist in your review of the General Plan Update (GPU) and the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in order to consider the series of actions that are before you, as outlined in the accompanying staff report.

The General Plan Update is a snapshot of Agoura Hills today, a vision of Agoura Hills tomorrow, and steps to achieve that vision. The GPU is a plan for the next 25 years, to 2035. State law requires each city and county to prepare and adopt a comprehensive long-range general plan for its physical development. A comprehensive general plan provides a consistent framework for land use decision making. The general plan and its maps, diagrams, and development goals, policies and measures form the basis for the City's zoning, subdivision, and public works actions. Under state law, no specific plan, area plan, community plan, zoning, subdivision map or public works project may be approved unless the City finds that it is consistent with the adopted General Plan.

The focus of the GPU is sustainability. Since our City is almost built out, the theme of the GPU is to sustain and enhance existing neighborhoods, travel corridors, commercial centers, and open spaces, while at the same time encouraging the redevelopment of older buildings and areas to provide better design and economic benefit to the City. Another common theme is enhancing a special sense of community reflecting the unique character of Agoura Hills through community programs, urban design, and preservation of the natural features of the City. The GPU also addresses recent state legislation regarding environmental sustainability, particularly reducing greenhouse gases, throughout the document, as there is an emphasis on resource protection and conservation, and encouraging transportation systems and development that promote alternative modes of travel (e.g., walking, cycling, transit).

The update of the General Plan has involved a process that has included several elected and appointed officials, residents, and public agencies; the compilation, review, and analysis of substantial amounts of technical data; the preparation of documents that summarize this information; and the input and feedback from community residents and stakeholders. The overall update process is summarized below in sequential order.

### **General Plan Advisory Committee**

A General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was established by the City Council to assure ongoing community involvement in the update process. The GPAC is comprised of two City Council members, two Planning Commissioners, and five to six "at large" resident representatives from various areas of the City. The GPAC met throughout the process of preparing the GPU to provide feedback to City staff and the consultant team, led by the firm of PBS&J, and was instrumental in the development of the GPU.

### **Resident Survey**

A survey questionnaire was mailed to about 7,300 households in the City in July 2005. The goal of the questionnaire was to receive feedback from the community on various items related to the

GPU, including development, transportation, public services, recreation/parks and quality of life. The City received 954 completed questionnaires, a good response rate of nearly 13 percent. The results of the survey indicate that most residents want to maintain the existing character of the City, including the small town feel, natural beauty, good schools, and the perceived safety. Most residents want to limit growth and relieve traffic congestion, and, at the same time, they indicate a need for more sit down restaurants, upscale retail stores, entertainment, and medical care offices, as well as more parks, open space, recreation facilities and paths/trails that connect various parts of the City. The residents also indicated a desire to maintain a positive image of the City from the freeway. The survey results and analysis were compiled in a document, "Survey of Residents Regarding General Plan Topics," prepared by True North Research (August 2006).

## **Stakeholder Interviews**

Stakeholder interviews occurred in March 2006. A total of 17 people representing the following sectors of the community participated:

- Schools
- Open space/environmental
- Religious/cultural/youth sports
- Homeowner associations
- Business representatives
- Residents (randomly selected from respondents to the survey)

Stakeholders were asked a series of questions about Agoura Hills: What should change and what should stay the same? What gives the City its character? What should the community look like in 10 to 20 years? The results of the interviews are summarized as follows:

*Land Use* – want more commercial rather than additional office uses; want ability to shop, have entertainment and go to restaurants in Agoura Hills rather than neighboring communities; provide sensitive development that respects the City's natural environment.

*Circulation* – not as busy or congested as neighboring cities, and should stay this way; on and off ramps are in need of improvement; more shuttle, bus routes and bicycle lanes needed.

*Housing* – differing views about housing (ranging from there should be more affordable housing like workforce housing to create mixed income areas, to no new apartment or condominium projects should be allowed).

*Open Space* - preserve open space, as it makes up the City's identity; capitalize on recreation opportunities; value hiking, biking and equestrian trails.

*Design* – examples of good design are City Hall and Library (Craftsman detail and stone masonry detail); need for more pedestrian and bike amenities along streetscape (benches, bike racks, bike lanes); importance of preserving image along Highway 101 and creating a gateway.

## Community Meeting – “Big Ideas”

On December 13, 2006, a joint City Council/Planning Commission public meeting, called the “Big Ideas Meeting,” was held at City Hall. The purpose of the meeting was threefold:

- Provide information to the City Council, Planning Commission, and public on the work accomplished to date on the General Plan Update;
- Request direction from the City Council and Planning Commission on defining the key issues to address in the GPU and confirm the identified study areas to be further analyzed; and
- Offer the public an opportunity to share ideas about future land use, circulation, and other planning issues related to the GPU.

All comments were summarized in a table that was presented to the GPAC for review. For the most part, the comments echoed those of the resident survey.

## Selection of Study Areas

With the assistance of staff and the GPU consultant, PBS&J, the GPAC identified 14 “study areas” in the City, starting in November 2006. The GPAC agreed with staff that there is limited vacant land that is available and feasible for development, but that the development cycle is such that existing developed areas could undergo changes over the next 25 years. Appendix A is a map of vacant parcels in the City by zone as of November 2006. Many of the vacant parcels on this map have now been entitled, are currently under construction, or have development applications being considered, leaving actually less land vacant at present.

The GPAC further agreed that, for the most part, the residential areas north of the freeway and open space areas are stable, and generally did not foresee any major land use changes over the GPU planning horizon. Therefore, the GPAC focused its efforts on particular locations in the City where change might occur from now through 2035. For the purposes of this task, these areas were defined as properties that may transition over the next 25 years, primarily because they contain older development, are areas with some vacant parcels, or are areas that provide opportunities for, and would benefit from, proactive advance planning. By 2008, some of the study areas had been eliminated, or boundaries changed, or areas merged or split, leaving 12 separate study areas, which were subsequently referred to as “subareas.”

Appendix B includes a map of the 12 “subareas.” For most subareas, there would not be a change in the allowed land uses, but the GPU would simply seek to improve the appearance or enhance the pedestrian amenities of the areas, or further encourage or protect land uses already allowed. These include the commercial recreation/open space uses of Subarea 1, the business park uses in Subarea 3, Subarea 6’s commercial/retail uses, Subarea 9’s residential development, Subarea 10’s commercial/retail uses, and the hillside residential neighborhoods in Subarea 12. The only areas where land use changes are identified are Subarea 5, where a planned development consisting of a mix of uses is proposed, and Study Area 8, where an option to include limited residential units in the existing retail centers is being proposed. For Subarea 2, which includes the properties adjacent to the intersection of Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Lake Lindero Drive, a change in designation from “Commercial Shopping Center” to “Commercial Neighborhood” is

recommended to better reflect the type and scale of commercial in this area, given that it primarily serves adjacent residential neighborhoods. In some areas, such as Subarea 11, a design overlay district may be sought to protect the existing character. For Subareas 4 (Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan) and 7 (Agoura Village Specific Plan), the respective specific plan documents in those subareas would continue to apply.

The GPAC re-confirmed these study areas at its meeting on April 13, 2009, and again on June 1, 2009. The subareas are discussed in greater detail in PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE.

## **Current Market Trends**

Stanley R. Hoffman and Associates, the GPU economic consultant, prepared "Current Market Trends City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update" (December 2006) to identify market opportunities in the City to help maintain a strong economic base. The report stressed the importance of the General Plan to include a mix of land uses that can contribute to increasing public revenues for the future.

## **Development of GPU Buildout Estimates**

Starting in early 2008, City staff and PBS&J applied general growth factors to fourteen discrete areas of the City, referred to as Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs), to account for additional development and density that may occur by the end of the next 25 years. The purpose of this exercise was to determine the maximum probable buildout of the General Plan Update for forecasting, and particularly to use for environmental analysis in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The projected buildout is based on staff's best estimate of the maximum level of buildout at the horizon year 2035, considering what is vacant, what is on the ground now, and how the area is likely to develop.

In non-residential areas, for the most part, a floor area ratio (FAR) factor was applied to individual land use categories to derive the likely density of development. An FAR is used to regulate density, and is calculated by dividing the total square footage of a building by the total lot square footage. The FAR selected was based on typical FARs for that type of use, particularly as demonstrated by existing on the ground development in the City. For example, an FAR of 0.4 was found to be most representative for commercial/retail uses in the City. The FAR was then applied to the lot square footage to determine the ultimate development in square feet that might occur in the TAZ by land use category. The FARs were applied to vacant lots, as well as to lots currently occupied but which are underutilized (not developed to their maximum practical density). However, for lots with newer developments that are not expected to be demolished and rebuilt to a higher density by 2035, the existing building square footage was considered the maximum development potential for 2035.

The additional residential development that might occur by 2035 was calculated by determining all vacant currently designated residential parcels in the City (mostly Old Agoura and Indian Hills), all of which are designated for single family homes. There are no vacant multi-family designated parcels in the City. With the exception of mixed-use Subareas 5 and 8, no new areas of the City were proposed for residential development. For these two subareas, PBS&J worked with staff to determine the number of multi-family units that might feasibly be constructed as part of a

mixed-use development by the horizon year. These figures were then added to the count of single family homes that could still be built on vacant currently designated residential parcels to come up with the total number of additional residential units in the City by 2035.

Similarly, PBS&J worked with staff to create a likely specific developed square footage scenario for the non-residential component of the proposed mixed use centers in Subareas 5 and 8. Here, specific changes were anticipated, and so an FAR was not utilized. In the Agoura Village Specific Plan and the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan areas, the maximum development permitted by these adopted Specific Plans was carried forward and assessed for buildout by 2035.

## **Vision Statement**

In January 2009, City staff and PBS&J worked with the GPAC to create the following vision statement for the GPU. The vision statement is a philosophy that guides the GPU.

*Agoura Hills is a special place, surrounded by the Santa Monica Mountains, where oak trees and rolling hills abound. Here we seek to preserve our city's best qualities while striving to create a better community. The future Agoura Hills is an attractive city of growing sophistication that chooses to retain its small town look and feel. The city remains a safe place, where people live, work, play and move about in an economically viable and environmentally sustainable community. Sensitive growth and economic development are means of perpetuating our quality of life. These are balanced with resource conservation, as the city's semi-rural ranching past, rich history and unique neighborhoods are respected, and open spaces and surrounding hillsides are preserved. Agoura Hills is a place where its citizens have opportunities to engage in their community through recreation, social and civic activities, schools and neighborhood organizations.*

## **Fiscal Impact Analysis**

The buildout figures described earlier were then utilized by Stanley R. Hoffman and Associates, to conduct a fiscal impact analysis of the proposed 2035 buildout scenario, entitled "Fiscal Impact Analysis General Plan Update" (February 2009). In particular, the study used the incremental development anticipated by 2035 in housing units, population (derived from the number of housing units), non-residential square feet and employment (derived from the square footage), as well as estimated valuation and taxable sales. The City's adopted fiscal year 2008-09 budget was used as a typical year for the development of long-range revenue and cost projections, notwithstanding the current economic downturn over the next few years. Fiscal year 2008-09 was thought to be a reasonable year upon which to base future conditions, considering the 2035 horizon year. The study answered the question of how the proposed 2035 growth scenario and mix of land uses would affect the City's budget by demonstrating that a net revenue surplus would result, with a revenue to cost ratio of 1.27.

## **Traffic Impact Analysis**

Likewise, Fehr & Peers, the GPU traffic consultant, also utilized the buildout figures to determine the possible traffic scenario in 2035 with the proposed GPU. It is important to remember that this is a forecast only, based on reasonable predictions and modeling, and considering a maximum reasonable development scenario. Fehr & Peers conducted a segment

analysis, as opposed to an intersection analysis, of possible traffic impacts from growth. The segment analysis assigns Levels of Service (LOS) from A to F to segments of a roadway, and does not analyze intersection capacity. The segment analysis is most often used for long range planning, particularly General Plans. On the other hand, the intersection analysis is used as individual development projects are proposed and a traffic impact analysis is conducted for that particular development, since the intersection analysis requires more specific information only available when a site is designed. There are 43 road segments or links analyzed as part of the study, versus 17 critical intersections analyzed in the current General Plan (1993). The traffic study was utilized in the formation of the goals and policies of the GPU, as well as in the EIR analysis. This traffic study is referred to as "City of Agoura Hills General Plan Update Mobility Element," (Fehr & Peers, October 2009). Further discussion of traffic is included in this document in PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.

### **Community Information Meeting**

A community information meeting was held on July 28, 2009. The meeting was a follow up to the community meeting held in December 2006, where the public provided initial input regarding the issues that should be addressed in the GPU, and voiced other opinions about what they liked and did not like about the City from a land use and development standpoint. Information provided at the community information meeting was in response to these concerns and indicated how the GPU is addressing them. The meeting highlighted the key goals and policies of the GPU. The public asked questions and provided comments, which staff and PBS&J responded to at the meeting.

### **Study Sessions**

Individual study sessions, one with the City Council, and one with the Planning Commission, were held on October 28, 2009 and October 15, 2009, respectively. The purpose of the study sessions was for City staff and PBS&J to present the Draft GPU to the Council and Commission in an informal session, and respond to questions the Council and Commission may have about the document. Members of the public were in attendance to hear the presentation, and spoke at the City Council study session, although it was not a public hearing.

### **Availability of GPU and Comments on GPU**

The Draft GPU was made available for public review in mid-October 2009. A notice of the document's availability was mailed to about 300 agencies, individuals, and groups. The document was posted on the City's website, with a special General Plan Update information page created. Hardcopies of the document were made available for review at City Hall and the Agoura Hills Library.

Throughout the GPU process, an "interest list" was kept by staff. By asking to be placed on the list, individuals were kept informed of the major milestones in the GPU process, including opportunities for public input. The individuals on this list were notified of the availability of the Draft GPU.



Since the Draft GPU's release, written comments from individuals, groups and agencies have been submitted to the City. These letters are included in Appendix C.

The above noted traffic report is included in the EIR Appendix, which has been provided to you. The remaining technical reports are included in the GPU Appendix, available for review at City Hall. Many of these are also on the City's website.

## PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

The current City of Agoura Hills General Plan, adopted May 1993 by the City Council, contains nine separate elements: Land Use; Circulation; Noise; Public Safety; Seismic Safety; Scenic Highways; Public Facilities, Utilities and Services; Community Design; and Economic Development. The proposed GPU format consists of the following four larger elements (“super elements”) that combine all of the topics addressed in the current General Plan, as well as additional topics, into four groupings. The focus of the GPU was on primarily the land use and mobility components, although all issues identified below are addressed.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chapter 2</b> <b><u>Community Conservation and Development</u></b></p> <p>Land Use and Community Form Economic Development Historic and Cultural Resources (Housing)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chapter 3</b> <b><u>Infrastructure and Public Services</u></b></p> <p>Mobility Utility Infrastructure Community Services</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chapter 4</b> <b><u>Natural Resources</u></b></p> <p>Open Space Visual Resources Biological Resources Water Air Quality Mineral Resources Energy Conservation Climate Change</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chapter 5</b> <b><u>Community Safety</u></b></p> <p>Flood Hazards Geological and Seismic Hazards Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards Crime Prevention and Protection Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Noise</p>

There are several reasons why the super element approach is preferable. Functionally related goals and policies can be grouped in one area of the document, thereby minimizing redundancy and ensuring better internal consistency. The super elements tend to be more easily readable, and the inter-relatedness of the sustainability theme as a means to maintain and refine Agoura Hills can be easily demonstrated in this combined format. It is for these reasons that many California cities are now using the super element format for General Plans.

Each element contains goals and policies. Goals describe ideal future conditions for a particular topic, and are general and broad. Policies provide guidance to the City to make decisions relating to each goal. They may include guidelines or standards against which decisions can be evaluated. After seven meetings in 2009, the GPAC completed its review of the goals and policies of each of these elements prepared by PBS&J and City staff. Together, City staff, PBS&J, and the GPAC fine tuned the goals and policies.

Implementation measures identify the specific steps to be taken to implement the policies. They translate the policies into actions. The actions may include revisions of current codes and ordinances, or the creation of guidelines, plans and capital improvements, programs, financing, and other measures. The implementation measures were prepared by City staff. Implementation measures are provided for all of the elements together in the Implementation Program (Chapter 6). Each implementation measure corresponds to at least one policy. The time frame for carrying out each implementation measure, as well as the City department(s) responsible for carrying out the implementation measure are listed in Chapter 6. The timing and prioritization of the implementation measures are at the discretion of the City Council. A separate meeting would be held with the City Council after GPU adoption to obtain direction regarding timing of the implementation measures.

Chapter 1 provides an Introduction to the GPU. Appendix A of the GPU, bound in the GPU volume, identifies the GPU policies that address global climate change, in order to comply with state legislation regarding greenhouse gases.

The Housing Element is the only General Plan element for which state law provides for independent review and certification by the State of California. Because of the shorter required update cycle and special requirements associated with the Housing Element, the 2008-2014 Agoura Hills' Housing Element is bound separately from the General Plan Update. The Housing Element was adopted by the City Council in October 2008 and certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in January 2009.

The following is an overview of the most important aspects of the four elements, followed by a list of key items within each element for your consideration.

## CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

### A. Land Use & Community Form

The Land Use & Community Form goals and policies guide the built environment of the City.

#### 1. Land Use Designations

The “Land Use Diagram” (Appendix D) shows the proposed land use designations, along with their densities and intensities. There are no changes to densities and intensities in existing land use designation categories.

Three new land use designation categories are proposed:

- Commercial Shopping Center-Mixed Use
- Planned Development
- Commercial Neighborhood Center

These designations are described further below in Section 2. Areas of Change.

The following two land use designations have been removed:

- Specific Plan
- Rural Residential

“Specific Plan” has been replaced with “Planned Development” to be more consistent with state requirements for the relationship between Specific Plans and General Plans (i.e., a General Plan can no longer have a land use designation of Specific Plan). However, this is simply a name change, and the underlying provisions in the particular Specific Plans (Agoura Village and Ladyface Mountain) still remain. “Rural Residential” has been deleted, as there are no longer any properties with such a designation in the City, nor does staff anticipate any properties to be identified for such a designation. Aside from the deletion of the Rural Residential category, no changes to residential categories are proposed.

#### 2. Areas of Change

There are numerous goals and policies that apply generally throughout all land use designation categories of the City, and carry forward the overall philosophy of the GPU to sustain and enhance the Agoura Hills community from land use, development and design perspectives. They reflect the following themes:

New Objectives:

- Enhancing pedestrian orientation and linkages among all land uses, community services, and City areas

- Revitalizing and enhancing design of commercial retail areas and shopping centers, including more attractive buildings and site and pedestrian amenities
- Promoting the addition of support services in business park office and manufacturing areas to reduce the need to travel off-site
- Incorporating sustainable design, including green building code requirements and use of green building technologies, such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), into development

Continuing Objectives:

- Maintaining residential neighborhood integrity
- Creating well-designed and attractive commercial corridors

With regard to residential uses, the GPU aims to maintain the identity, scale and character of the City's neighborhoods. The issue of land use compatibility is further addressed in the GPU in Policy LU-7.11, which aims to protect residential neighborhoods from the encroachment of incompatible non-residential uses. Implementation Measure LU-17 furthers this policy by requiring a review of allowed uses in commercial land use designations, identifying any uses that may pose compatibility concerns with neighboring residential or other sensitive uses, and then updating the Zoning Ordinance as applicable to address potential compatibility concerns.

There are also proposed changes directed at specific areas of the City. The GPU identified twelve subareas (see map in Appendix B), which were studied further. These subareas and the proposed types of change are summarized in the following table. Only one subarea, Subarea 9, is within an existing residential area.

Subarea	Type of Change
<b>Retain Existing Land Use Designation with Expanded Policies</b>	
1	Further ensure open space is maintained and compatibility with adjoining residential uses (p. 2-33 GPU)
3	Further encourage the development of limited ancillary uses that support existing business to minimize off-site travel, and require pedestrian connectivity among uses (p. 2-34 GPU)
6	Promote site and landscape improvements (p. 2-39 GPU)
9	Promote property maintenance and improvements and pedestrian connectivity with adjacent non-residential uses (p. 2-41 GPU)
10	Promote streetscape and site design improvements (p. 2-42 GPU)
11	Create a distinct district to reflect the area's history and character in design and development (p. 2-42 GPU); this may include a special design overlay for the Old Agoura commercial area
12	Reinforce Hillside Ordinance and promote lot consolidation (p.2-43 GPU)
<b>Revise Land Use Designation with No Change of Permitted Uses</b>	
2	Change from Commercial Shopping Center to Commercial Neighborhood Center to ensure compatibility with adjoining residential neighborhoods; promote streetscape design improvements (p. 2-33 GPU)
4	Change from Specific Plan to Planned Development (p.2-37 GPU)
7	Change from Specific Plan to Planned Development (p. 2-39 GPU)
<b>Revise Land Use Designation with Change in Permitted Uses</b>	
5	Change from Business Park-Manufacturing to Planned Development to provide for integrated redevelopment of the properties as a mixed use center (p. 2-38 GPU)
8	Change from Commercial Shopping Center to Commercial Shopping Center – Mixed Use to allow the potential for mixed use (addition of residential) to the existing commercial uses under certain conditions (p. 2-40 GPU)

Subareas 5 and 8 have the most substantial changes, and Subarea 2 warrants additional discussion. These three subareas are described more below.

Subarea 5 is generally located west of Kanan Road and north of Agoura Road, and adjacent to Agoura Village. It is bound by U.S. Highway 101 on the north, Kanan Village Plaza on the east, Agoura Road on the south, and the County Animal Shelter on the west. The goal is to allow mixed use, with a variety of commercial uses (retail, office, commercial recreation, entertainment) and some residential uses to further build upon Agoura Village, as well as provide a cohesive element to the current fragmented uses, especially given this area's location abutting the freeway and therefore having substantial visibility to passersby. The option for residential development is to provide not only additional housing opportunities in the City, consistent with the Housing Element, but to

create a full mixed use community, thereby possibly reducing vehicle trips to and from the area, and taking advantage of proximity to Agoura Village.

The current land use designation, Business Park-Manufacturing, provides for larger scale businesses involved in light manufacturing; research and development; assembly; and distribution services. Currently, Subarea 5 consists of some office and church uses, storage yards and buildings, a car wash, and some limited retail uses associated with the building industry. This area is tucked in among uses that are more service retail/restaurant (east side) and office oriented (west side), with the mixed use Agoura Village to the south, and the freeway to the north. Redesignating the future land use of this area to a mixed use planned development area, as proposed in the GPU, would encourage more commercial retail and office use, including possibly entertainment and commercial recreation uses (and the option of housing) to create a more attractive built environment from the freeway and to complement Agoura Village, as well as provide greater continuity along Agoura Road from corporate office uses on the west toward more retail uses to the east. It would create an opportunity to replace the existing manufacturing and open storage yard uses with uses more compatible with a planned development.

A master plan, specific plan or other regulatory document must first be prepared for this subarea to ensure an integrated development of the various properties, and would address land use and development standards. Until that regulatory document is prepared and adopted, the development of uses would need to be consistent with the current Business Park-Manufacturing designation. Therefore, a critical decision of the City would be the timing of preparation of the regulatory document. The existing manufacturing and storage related uses, as legal non-conforming uses, could continue to exist in Subarea 5 under such a regulatory document, but could not expand or be replaced.

Subarea 8 consists of the three shopping centers along Kanan Road: Agoura Meadows Shopping Center (Vons/CVS); Twin Oaks Plaza (Ralphs/Rite Aid); and Agoura Hills City Mall. The first two consist of retail and financial related uses only, while the third also contains a partial second story of offices. The intent for these centers is to improve their economic vitality and create in them a focal point for neighborhood activity and socializing. Ideally, the centers should be welcoming to pedestrians in terms of access and activities, and include expanded sidewalks along the buildings and plazas; delineated and attractive pedestrian corridors that link parking areas with buildings; outdoor oriented uses like restaurants; and more aesthetically pleasing landscaping and amenities such as benches and artistic elements/features. As an incentive to revitalization, the consensus of the GPAC was to endorse a proposal to provide an option for the development of limited/ancillary multi-family residential housing above the commercial uses in these three

centers, providing that the centers implement the above noted design and development improvements. Therefore, the GPU contains goals and policies to that end.

These three centers would retain their "Commercial Shopping Center" designation, but would also include another designation of "Mixed Use." This would be the only Mixed Use designated area in the City. Note that the other mixed use areas of the City (Proposed Subarea 5 and the Agoura Village Specific Plan, would be designated Planned Development, which requires a separate regulatory document, such as a Specific Plan, or a master plan, that would address design and development standards). It is important to note that the potential for multi-family housing is solely optional on the part of the property owner. The added designation of Mixed Use does not mean that the properties must develop as mixed use centers, but that they may if the property owner elects to provide such use, and consequently further enhances the center through additional pedestrian and design amenities. In the mean time, goals and policies of the GPU encourage improved pedestrian and design amenities in existing shopping centers, including these three in particular, and require them for new shopping centers developed in the City.

Subarea 2 consists of the four corners at the intersection of Lake Lindero Drive and Agoura Road, including three small shopping centers and a portion of the Lake Lindero Country Club. Currently, this subarea is designated "Commercial Shopping Center." The only other area of the City with this designation is Subarea 8, noted above. The character of these two subareas is substantially different. Subarea 8 has larger scale multi-tenant shopping destinations, while Subarea 2 consists of small retail centers. As such, the GPU proposes to redesignate Subarea 2 as "Commercial Neighborhood." This new designation would allow for continued retail uses, and would require that new development and any site improvements be designed for compatibility with adjoining residential neighborhoods. The designation would also provide for improved design of any new substantial improvement or additions. The streetscape would be improved to enhance the visual character and quality.

This particular retail area is called out due primarily to the change in land use designation from Commercial Shopping Center to Commercial Neighborhood. However, the design improvements that are triggered by development in this subarea can also be applied to other existing developments in the City, including other retail centers. Goal LU-13 pertains to well designed and attractive commercial districts. Policies LU-13.1 and LU-13.2 describe design character, including architecture and site design, that new development, renovation, infill and redevelopment would need to comply with. Therefore, improvements in design and architecture in other commercial centers in the City can be realized through making findings that a renovation or infill or redevelopment project is consistent with these GPU goals and policies.



Additionally, there are two minor parcels, which are not within subareas, proposed for land use designation changes as part of the GPU:

Assessor's Parcel No. 2048003002. This private parcel has a split land use designation. The majority is Restricted Open Space, while a smaller triangular piece adjacent to the northeastern corner of Agoura High School is designated Public Facility. This appears to be a mapping error that until now was not identified. Public Facility land is not commonly owned by a private property owner. As such, the GPU proposes to eliminate the Public Facilities designation on the small portion, and replace it with Restricted Open Space so that the entire parcel has one designation.

Assessor's Parcel No. 2048011034. This parcel is a narrow, triangular piece of land north of the freeway and south of Canwood Street, near the intersection of Clareton Drive and Canwood Street. Currently, this parcel contains a billboard sign, and is designated Business Park – Office Retail (BP-OR). The GPU proposes a change in designation to Commercial Retail Service (CRS). The parcel is located amidst a mix of designations, including Commercial Retail Service, Business Park-Office Retail, and Business Park-Manufacturing. The three closest lots to the east of the parcel are Business Park-Office Retail, followed by two Commercial Retail Service lots. The use to the northwest is also Commercial Retail Service, and to the north is Business Park-Manufacturing. The change to a CRS designation is more appropriate for smaller, individual retail establishments, given the limited-sized, irregularly-shaped parcel, as opposed to the BP-OR, which is geared toward planned developments. The CRS allows for a wider range of retail services, and also allows all of the same office uses as that provided in the BP-OR zone.

### 3. Build Out

Based on build out of the Land Use Diagram (Appendix D), the following is the total amount of development that could occur in the City by 2035, including existing 2009 development and future development provided for under the GPU.

- 8,139 housing units
- About 1.85 million square feet of retail services
- About 3.43 million square feet of business park/office uses
- About 1.1 million square feet of business park manufacturing uses.

The following table illustrates the total development possible under the GPU (“Plan Capacity”) in comparison to the existing on the ground development as of 2009 (“Existing”), and then identifies the incremental increase between these two (“Growth”).

Land Use	Existing	Plan Capacity	Growth
<b>Housing</b>			
Single Family	5,312	5,428	116
Multi-Family	2,298	2,711	413
<i>Total Housing</i>	7,610	8,139	529
<b>Retail Service</b>	1,225,113	1,850,907	625,794
<b>Office/Business Park</b>	2,333,157	3,431,448	1,098,291
<b>Manufacturing/Business Park</b>	844,681	1,118,126	273,445

It is possible, but not likely, that the City would reach these development levels. These numbers are guesstimates for planning purposes, and are required to be estimated and analyzed as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the GPU, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This is to ensure that potential impacts from the “maximum case scenario” of the GPU are sufficiently assessed within a series of environmental issue areas. The EIR and CEQA are discussed in more detail in PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT of this Decision Making Workbook.

It is helpful to consider the current General Plan, adopted in 1993, to further understand why this maximum development scenario for 2035 is feasible but not likely. The 1993 General Plan considered the City of Agoura Hills in the future 2010. The maximum buildout of the City per the 1993 General Plan compared with that of the proposed General Plan Update is summarized in the following table, with the existing development figures as of 2009 shown for context:

Land Use	Existing 2009	1993 GP	GPU
<b>Housing</b>			
Single Family	5,312	5,428	5,428
Multi-Family	2,298	2,591	2,711
<i>Total Housing</i>	7,610	8,019	8,139
<b>Retail Service</b>	1,225,113	2,683,912	1,850,907
<b>Office/Business Park</b>	2,333,157	5,280,763	3,431,448
<b>Manufacturing/Business Park</b>	844,681	2,258,973	1,118,126

As shown above, the amount of non-residential development planned for the future in the 1993 General Plan is more than the 2009 existing on the ground development (and more than the maximum buildout scenario in the proposed GPU by 2035). Therefore, what was forecasted as a maximum development scenario in the existing General Plan did not occur, even though the last ten years saw a gain in development projects in the City. Likewise, the maximum buildout identified in the GPU by 2035 may also not be reached.

The proposed GPU decreases the maximum buildout scenario from the 1993 General Plan, but it still accounts for a maximum development scenario in which all vacant land is developed and all underutilized lots are redeveloped to their

theoretical maximum FAR, which may not occur by 2035. It is possible that the theoretical maximum FAR would not be reached due to zoning requirements related to height, building and lot setbacks, and parking, as well as natural site constraints like topography, which all need to be considered when designing a site. The amount of single family development is the same as the existing General Plan, but the number of multi-family units is slightly greater under the proposed GPU buildout, given the plans for Subareas 5 and 8.

The above noted growth and new development in the City per the GPU would be infill, including developing vacant lots and redeveloping properties, and therefore protecting surrounding open space areas. Development on the edges of the City, in the Ladyface Mountain Specific Plan (LMSP) and the Agoura Village Specific Plan (AVSP) areas, would continue according to those approved plans. All open space designated areas would remain as open space.

## **B. Economic Development**

The Economic Development goals and policies encourage a strong and sustainable economic base, and a sound fiscal management of the City.

### **1. Fiscal Base**

Key policy items are to target new retail opportunities along Highway 101; diversify the City's economic base; promote retention of existing businesses; and continue to provide efficient and adequate public services and infrastructure to draw businesses to the City. In addition to the Economic Development goals and policies, Policies LU-12.1, LU-12.2, LU-12.3 and LU-12.4 in the Land Use and Community Form section of the Community Conservation and Development Element also support economic development by addressing the location of businesses for greater visibility while assuring appropriate and attractive design.

### **2. Fiscal Sustainability**

Policies to ensure that the City is fiscally sustainable include establishing a system to monitor economic and fiscal performance, and using more environmentally sustainable and efficient methods to provide public services and infrastructure to ensure cost effectiveness. Understandably, some of these policies correlate with those in the Infrastructure and Community Services Element (Chapter 3) and the Natural Resources Element (Chapter 4).

## **C. Historic and Cultural Resources**

This section addresses three issues: protecting historic resources; promoting a cultural environment; and protecting archaeological and paleontological resources in the City. The issue of historic resources in the City warrants further discussion. The most notable historic and cultural resource in the City is the Reyes Adobe. Nonetheless, the Reyes Adobe is not qualified for special listing as an historic resource at the state or federal level

listing due to modifications to the building. It is possible, although not likely, that there are other structures in the City that may be eligible for state or federal historic status. However, no comprehensive Citywide inventory of historic resources has been prepared to confirm or deny this assumption. Implementation Measure HR-1 states that the City shall consider creating a program to identify historic resources. With or without such a program, Implementation Measure HR-7 would apply. HR-7 requires that for a project application involving a structure that potentially exhibits characteristics of an historic resource, an historic assessment be conducted that determines whether the structure would qualify for historic listing, and if so, assesses the project's impacts to the structure.

Policy HR-1.1 identifies protecting and preserving significant historic resources, to the extent feasible. Reyes Adobe is the cultural focal point of the City, and the GPU policies would apply to this landmark. This policy might also apply to other structures, regardless of whether they are eligible for state or federal listing. The words, "to the extent feasible," are critical, as the GPU does not prohibit across the board the demolition or substantial alteration of any structure that may be found to have historic merit. Because of this, as you will read later in PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, the EIR finds that the GPU may result in potentially significant and unmitigable impacts to historic resources. The absence of a broad demolition prohibition does not mean that historic resources would not be preserved. Rather, the decision making body would evaluate the individual merits of a structure and take them into account in deciding whether to approve a project that would affect such a structure.

Cultural, fine arts and performing arts are highlighted in this section as well. The goal is to promote the arts in general in the City, including identifying venues and encouraging community participation in art activities.

## ***Community Conservation and Development Items to Consider:***

### 1. Subarea 5

Should this subarea be approved for a Planned Development designation that would require the preparation of a regulatory document to provide for a cohesive development of a mixed use nature, encouraging retail, office, entertainment, commercial recreation and ancillary multi-family residential uses?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Subarea 8

Should this subarea be approved for the addition of a Mixed Use designation along with the existing Commercial Shopping Center designation, which would allow for the option of adding ancillary multi-family residential units above ground floor retail as an incentive to redevelopment? (This would be in addition to exploring other regulatory and/or financial incentives to encourage renovation).

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Historic Resources – Allowance for Substantial Alteration or Demolition

Should the policies aim to broadly protect all historic resources that may be identified in the future from any substantial alteration or demolition, or allow consideration on a case by case basis?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Other Comments/Recommendations on the Community Conservation and Development Chapter?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## CHAPTER 3: INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

### A. Mobility

The Mobility goals and policies aim to provide a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation network while maintaining the character of Agoura Hills. This section acknowledges that the City is a primarily built out community with an established roadway network.

#### 1. Roadway and Interchange Improvements

Two freeway interchanges (Reyes Adobe Road, Palo Comado/Chesebro Road) and five roadway segments (Agoura Road west of Kanan Road, Chesebro Road, Kanan Road south of Agoura Road, Canwood Street, Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive) have been identified for future improvement and inclusion on the Capital Improvements Program list. (The Reyes Adobe Interchange Project is included in the GPU, even though construction commenced late in 2009).

#### 2. Alternative Transportation

Numerous policies speak to reducing the reliance on single occupancy vehicle trips, and encouraging the use of bicycles, walking, and transit. The concept of “complete streets” is addressed. This refers to a transportation system that serves all modes of travel and meets the needs of all users. One of the main goals of this area of the Mobility section is to physically connect the different parts of the City in more sustainable ways. Goals and policies on pedestrian connectivity and accommodating bike facilities are threaded throughout the various elements of the GPU, but are primarily located in the Mobility section. A Bikeway Master Plan is proposed, as well as an Urban Pedestrian Plan, both of which seek to create more viable and user-friendly options apart from auto use, and expand upon existing bikeways and pedestrian paths and sidewalks. Policies also address further coordination with Metro to improve transit opportunities, as well as to expand special shuttle services.

#### 3. More Efficient Transportation

In addition to alternative modes, the goals and policies address improving the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance to encourage greater participation, and incorporation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Traffic Management Systems (TMS), which are electronic systems that help improve the efficiency and safety of vehicle routes (e.g., signal timing synchronization, advanced traveler information).

#### 4. Levels of Service

Even with the above noted physical improvements (Item 1) several roadway segments would continue to operate below the standard level of service “C,” which indicates a stable flow. These include segments that are currently adversely impacted, such as Kanan Road north of Canwood Street; Kanan Road south of Agoura Road; Agoura Road east of Kanan Road; Canwood Street east of Kanan Road; Driver Road between Argos Street and Chesebro Road just before school starting and ending hours; and Lake Lindero Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard just before school starting and ending hours. Additional segments are Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road, and Dorothy Drive between the Lewis Road and U.S. 101 ramps. The City Council has already determined that Agoura Road east of Kanan Road should remain a two-lane road, and staff, PBS&J and the GPAC have proposed that other widenings are not practical due to limited land availability in the right-of-way and in consideration of neighborhood character and quality of life issues (e.g., pedestrian friendliness; maintenance of existing landscaping, medians, bikeways, and sidewalks; aesthetics; and retaining the small town feel of Agoura Hills). As such, the GPU does not propose roadway widenings in areas where there is limited land availability in the right-of-way and where neighborhood character and quality of life issues would be jeopardized. Also, the GPU includes Policy M-1.3 to maintain an LOS C standard on most roadways, but allow a reduced LOS standard of D, E or F on the specific above-noted roadway segments. It would be inconsistent to require a LOS C on a roadway that currently operates at LOS E, with no practical means of physically improving the roadway to improve the LOS.

It is important to note that the LOS analysis conservatively did not assume the implementation of the measures listed in Items 2 and 3 above. There is no clear methodology for quantifying to what extent alternative methods of travel, and TDM, TMS and ITS programs would improve the LOS on a roadway. Therefore, the actual effect of traffic on the roads may be eased somewhat by using these measures, but the benefits of such use have not been assumed in the LOS analysis. Therefore, as described further in PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT of this Guidebook, the EIR determined that impacts to traffic load and capacity of the street system would be potentially significant and unmitigable.

#### 5. Parking

The Mobility section advocates for shared parking for uses with varied peak parking periods to offer flexibility in accommodating parking demand, and ensure the prudent use of land.

## **B. Utility Infrastructure**

The Utility Infrastructure goals and policies aim to provide adequate, efficient, and where appropriate, environmentally sustainable, sources of water and power; sewage collection; storm water conveyance; and communication and cable services. In particular, this section emphasizes water conservation and minimizing waste entering landfills.

## **C. Community Services**

Goals and policies pertaining to Community Services are necessary to continue to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the residents. Recreation and park facilities make up a significant portion of the goals and policies.

### **1. Park Master Plan**

An update of the Park Master Plan is identified. The current Master Plan was prepared in the 1980s, and in many ways no longer reflects the current community services facilities and programs in the City, nor the future approach for community services. An updated Master Plan would provide a current set of standards for maintaining and improving the City parks and recreation facilities.

### **2. Sharing of Resources**

Shared use of facilities is encouraged to expand opportunities for recreation and reduce costs, as well as aim to provide a variety of services in different parts of the City to minimize distance traveled and increase convenience.

### **3. Focus on Health and Community**

The Community Services section addresses recreation programs and special events that promote healthy lifestyles and community identity.

## ***Infrastructure and Community Services***

### ***Item to Consider:***

#### **1. Mobility**

Along heavily trafficked roads, should the policies avoid widening of the roads in areas of limited land availability in the right-of-way, where it would adversely affect neighborhood character and the quality of life? An example of this would be Kanan Road, north of Highway 101.

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



---

---

2. Other Comments/Recommendations on the Mobility Chapter?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

## CHAPTER 4: NATURAL RESOURCES

The Natural Resources Element addresses many resources that warrant protection in the City: open space, visual, biological, water, air, minerals and energy. This Element also addresses one of the latest environmental issues of concern both at the state and federal levels, and globally: climate change and greenhouse gases.

Key issues are described below.

### 1. Visual Resources

The GPU addresses the continued protection of hillsides and locally scenic roads as visual resources. This includes maintaining the natural topography and ridgelines in the City.

### 2. Open Space, Hillsides and Trails

The GPU continues to ensure protection of the City's current open space lands and works to augment and enhance existing open space areas. Goals and policies have been formulated to ensure the continued preservation of open space and hillsides, and to develop the trail system called for in the Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan, approved by the City Council in January 2009. The trail system would link with the Urban Pedestrian Plan (identified in the Mobility section) facilities to complete a cohesive pedestrian system in the City from the urban areas into the outlying open space areas.

### 3. Biological Resources

With regard to biological resources, goals and policies focus on maintaining Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) and wildlife corridors and a connected open space system; enhancing creeks; continuing to preserve oak trees; and encouraging landscaping that benefits wildlife.

### 4. Water

Goals and policies focus on conserving water, and minimizing pollutants in the City's waterways and storm drain system. To minimize potable water use, further coordination with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District is called for to increase the availability of recycled water to additional areas and users in the City.

### 5. Climate Change

A specific section on climate change is included in this chapter to demonstrate compliance with recent state legislation regarding greenhouse gases. State law requires that General Plans address greenhouse gas emissions. In the next couple of years, the state is expected to provide specific guidance and requirements to cities regarding their role in reducing the "carbon footprint" that results in greenhouse gases (GHG). This is likely to include measuring the baseline GHG emissions upon which to assess future increases in the City from growth and development, and creating a specific plan to reduce

GHG emissions throughout the City. All cities in California must comply with these new state mandates. The policies in this section acknowledge that the City will continue to comply with all state mandates and programs as they are developed.

Since many issues can influence climate change, goals and policies throughout the four Elements of the GPU work to minimize greenhouse gases. Examples include: mixed use development (Chapter 2); alternative transportation (Chapter 3); minimizing the use of natural resources, such as water (Chapters 2 and 3); and promoting green spaces and open spaces (Chapters 2 and 4), among others. Appendix A of the GPU is a matrix that identifies the variety of GPU policies that address global climate change.

***Natural Resources  
Items to Consider:***

1. Comments/Recommendations on the Natural Resources Chapter?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## CHAPTER 5: COMMUNITY SAFETY

The Community Safety Element addresses flood hazards; geological and seismic hazards; wildland and urban fire hazards; crime prevention and protection; hazardous materials; emergency preparedness; and noise.

Key issues are described below.

### 1. Noise

Goals and policies continue to protect sensitive receptors from substantial noise generators. The focus of this section is not only new uses being located in areas with high ambient noise, but new noise-generating uses being sited in existing neighborhoods.

### 2. Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards

With regard to fuel modification, Policy S-3.9 ensures that new development complies with the County fuel modification requirements, and at the same time, protects natural resources and habitat to the extent possible.

### *Community Safety Items to Consider:*

1. Comments/Recommendations on the Community Safety Chapter?

Planning Commission Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## PART 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

### CEQA Process

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), General Plans are subject to CEQA. The City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the General Plan Update, which was mailed to all relevant local, state and federal agencies on April 28, 2009. The agencies had 30 days from the date of receipt of the NOP to provide responses to the NOP and inform the City of any environmental issues in the purview of each agency that should be addressed in the EIR. The NOP was also published in the *Acorn* on April 23, 2009. On May 21, 2009, a public scoping meeting on the NOP was held by the Planning Commission. The NOP and comments received are included in Appendix A of the Final EIR.

While the public comments were more germane to the GPU policies and goals, rather than the scope of the EIR, staff would note that both the Infrastructure and Community Services Element and the Natural Resources Element address the importance of trail linkages and contain several trail goals and policies, as well as refer the reader to the recently adopted Citywide Trails and Pathways Master Plan.

It is the nature of General Plan EIRs that they are often prepared concurrently with the GPU, although the GPU preparation is at least slightly ahead of the EIR. This is because it is preferable to have goals and policies that address potential environmental concerns proactively, as opposed to relying on standard CEQA mitigation measures, reacting to a potential impact. In this way, General Plans attempt to be “self-mitigating” to the extent possible.

The Draft EIR was completed in December 2009. A Notice of Availability/Notice of Intent to Adopt the EIR was prepared and published on December 10, 2009 in the *Acorn* and distributed to about 300 agencies, individuals, and groups. The document was posted on the City’s website, and hardcopies were made available for review at City Hall and the Agoura Hills Library. The CEQA-mandated 45-day public comment period began on December 10, 2009 and ended on January 25, 2010. Within this comment period, on January 21, 2010, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to receive oral comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. One person spoke at the hearing.

By the close of the public comment period, ten letters were received on the Draft EIR. City staff reviewed each comment submitted to the City and prepared a written response to each comment as part of the Responses to Comments required by CEQA. Oral comments received at the January 21, 2010 hearing were also addressed with written responses. The responses to the individual comments note where changes to the EIR text have occurred, if applicable. The Final EIR document, dated February 2010, consists of the Draft EIR; all of the public comments received on the Draft EIR, and responses to the items raised in these letters; technical appendices; and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that ensures proper implementation of the required mitigation measures. Any necessary changes to the EIR based on the public comments have been incorporated into the Final EIR text, and are also listed separately in Chapter 9 of the FEIR. The main change is a clarification. Kanan Road, south of Agoura Road was inadvertently omitted from the GPU and DEIR as a roadway with valuable scenic resources recognized by the City, and is now included. The revisions made to the EIR and the GPU as a result of the public comments are minor and do not

constitute significant new information added to the documents as defined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR was not required per CEQA.

On February 2, 2010, a copy of the full set of comments and the corresponding responses was mailed to each individual, agency or entity that provided comments on the Draft EIR, along with information on how to obtain a full copy of the Final EIR. A copy of the Final EIR is available online on the City's website, as well as available at the Planning Counter at City Hall and at the Agoura Hills Library. Notices of this public hearing and availability of the Final EIR and GPU were posted at City Hall, the City Recreation Center, and the Agoura Hills Library; published in the *Acorn*; and mailed to about 300 individuals, agencies and groups. For informational purposes, the Public Resources Code Section 21092.5(a) requires that the City provide responses to all comments received at least ten days prior to certifying the Final EIR.

## Content of EIR

A Program EIR was prepared for the GPU in accordance with CEQA Guidelines. A Program EIR is typically prepared when the project involves a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project, and in which the actions are closely related either geographically or temporally. Program EIRs generally analyze broad environmental effects of the project with the acknowledgement that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects or portions of the project at a later date.

The EIR assessed the potential impacts of implementing the GPU to the following environmental issue areas.

Aesthetics	Air Quality	Biological Resources
Cultural Resources	Geology and Soils	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Hydrology and Water Quality	Land Use Planning	Noise
Population, Housing, Employment	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation/Traffic	Utilities and Service Systems	Climate Change

Note that in many cases, approval of the GPU alone would not trigger environmental impacts, but that specific development projects that are proposed in the future under the GPU may. As these individual development projects are proposed, a specific CEQA analysis would be necessary, separate from this Program EIR. In some cases dealing with construction and project-related impacts, because specific development activity that may occur in the future is not known at this time, the EIR conservatively assumes that potentially significant impacts may result, even though that may not ultimately be the case.

The EIR project impacts are divided into three categories:

- Class I (Significant and Unavoidable) SU
- Class II (Less Than Significant, with or without Mitigation Measures) LTS
- Class III (No Impact) NI

These impacts are briefly listed in the Executive Summary of the EIR (Table 2-1). Class II means that an impact is either less than significant on its own, or is potentially significant, but with certain identified measures, can be mitigated to a level of insignificance. In this EIR, there are no

impacts that are potentially significant, but with the incorporation of a mitigation measure, result in a less than significant impact. If an impact would still be significant, even with application of the mitigation measures, or there are no feasible mitigation measures to be employed, then the impact is “significant and unavoidable” (Class I) For Class I impacts, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 is required. A SOC is a written statement explaining why an agency (City) is willing to accept each significant effect, after weighing the specific benefits and environmental disadvantages associated with the project.

A listing of the Class I impacts in the EIR is provided below. These are the anticipated impacts, even with incorporation of the numerous GPU goals and policies to protect the environment. If there are feasible mitigation measures that have been identified in the EIR, this is also noted in the table. Nonetheless, the impacts still remain significant, unavoidable. If the impact pertains to the effects of the General Plan only, it is designated as “project specific.” If the impact pertains to the effects of the General Plan within a larger regional context, it is designated “cumulative.”

Item	Impact	MM Applied?	Impact Before MM	Impact After MM
<b>Air Quality</b>				
4.2.2	New sources of regional air emissions conflicting with the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan. (Project Specific and Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> County’s AQMP has not yet been revised to include GPU’s new population, housing, and employment numbers.	None	SU	SU
4.2.3	New construction and operational emissions could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Project Specific and Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> The region is in non-attainment for several pollutants.	Yes	SU	SU
4.2-4	Cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which region is in non-attainment. (Project Specific and Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> The region is in non-attainment for several pollutants.	Yes	SU	SU
4.2.5	Sensitive receptors could be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Project Specific) <i>Reason:</i> Pollutants could concentrate in areas near sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, residences) from construction activity and ongoing operation of uses.	Yes	SU	SU
<b>Cultural Resources</b>				
4.4.3	Possible substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. (Project Specific) <i>Reason:</i> While there are no known or suspected historical resources in the City that could be	None	SU	SU

	candidates for state or federal listing, it is possible that a structure is identified in the future. The GPU advocates protection of historical resources, but does not prohibit their alteration or demolition as a general rule.			
<b>Noise</b>				
4.9-6	Generation of noise levels that exceed the noise standards established by the City. (Project Specific) <i>Reason:</i> Areas of the City currently exceed City noise standards. Therefore, construction and operation of future development projects would further exacerbate this condition.	None	SU	SU
4.9-7	Construction activities could generate or expose people or structures to excessive groundborne vibration. (Project Specific and Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> Construction could result in the use of equipment that could cause temporary groundborne vibration.	None	SU	SU
<b>Population, Housing, Employment</b>				
4.10-1	While the population increase by 2035 estimated in the proposed General Plan would not be considered substantial in a cumulative context, it results in an inconsistency with SCAG's published growth forecasts. (Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> SCAG's growth forecast has not yet been revised to include the proposed General Plan's anticipated minor population growth.	None	SU	SU
<b>Transportation/Traffic</b>				
4.13-5	Increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. (Project Specific and Cumulative) <i>Reason:</i> Roadways are currently congested. Additional trips would further add to this condition.	None	SU	SU

As evident in the table above, many of the Class I impacts are due in part to already impacted conditions in the City. These include air quality, noise and traffic. The historic resources issue is described fully in PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE. The remaining impacts occur as a result of the GPU revising the estimated future population, housing and employment numbers in the City, and other existing regional plans, adopted in prior years, not reflecting these new numbers.

Further discussion of traffic is warranted. The traffic study indicates that eleven of the 43 analyzed segments in the City currently operate below LOS C during at least one peak hour period, which is considered the minimum acceptable level identified in the current General Plan. These segments are:

- Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
- Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard



- Kanan Road south of Agoura Road
- Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East
- Lake Lindero Drive north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
- Driver Avenue east of Argos Street
- Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road
- Palo Comado Canyon Road east of Chesebro Road
- Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive
- Palo Comado Canyon Road south of US-101
- Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road

Note that the impacts along Driver Avenue and Lake Lindero Drive are primarily derived from school trips during the AM peak period.

With the GPU buildout, the following segments are expected to operate below LOS C. They are listed by segment number per the traffic study.

#	Peak Hour	Segment Name
1	AM	Lake Lindero Drive north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
8	AM and PM	Kanan Road south of Fountainwood Street
9	AM and PM	Kanan Road north of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
12	AM and PM	Kanan Road south of Thousand Oaks Boulevard
13	AM	Driver Avenue east of Argos Street
16	PM	Canwood Street west of Reyes Adobe Road
21	PM	Kanan Road south of Canwood Street East
23	PM	Canwood Street east of Kanan Road
24	AM and PM	Kanan Road north of Agoura Road
26	PM	Agoura Road east Kanan Road
27	PM	Kanan Road south of Agoura Road
29	PM	Agoura Road east of Cornell Road
31	AM	Driver Avenue west of Chesebro Road
34	PM	Dorothy Drive between Lewis Road and US 101 SB Ramps
35	AM	Chesebro Road south of Dorothy Drive
36	PM	Agoura Road west of Chesebro Road

These results assume that by 2035 the improvements proposed and outlined on page 3-15 of the GPU (and noted in this Guidebook in PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, Chapter 3 Infrastructure and Community Services, A. Mobility) are implemented. These include some improvements identified in the 1993 General Plan and carried forward, as well as some new roadway improvements. Improvements called out in the 1993 General Plan that are no longer proposed and so not assumed in the traffic analysis are:

- ✓ Agoura Road – 4 lanes from Kanan Road to Liberty Canyon Road
- ✓ Kanan Road – 6 lanes from Agoura Road to Laro Drive
- ✓ Kanan Road – 4 lanes from Agoura Road to Cornell Road
- ✓ Canwood Street – 4 lanes from Kanan Road to Chesebro/Palo Comado Canyon Roads

These improvements are not assumed, as the City Council has already determined that Agoura Road east of Kanan Road should remain a two-lane road, and staff, PBS&J and the GPAC have proposed that the other widenings are not practical due to limited land availability in the right-of-way and in consideration of neighborhood character and quality of life issues (e.g., pedestrian friendliness, maintenance of landscaping, aesthetics, maintaining the small town feel of Agoura Hills).

Consequently, as described in PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, the GPU proposes allowing a reduced LOS at the above noted segments, and includes alternatives to constructing traditional roadway improvements, such as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), and the promotion of other modes of travel. However, the alternative improvements may still not result in an LOS of C or better on the same segment. Regardless of whether the LOS standard is reduced on certain key roadway segments, the GPU would result in additional trips being added to an already congested roadway system, thereby creating a significant and unavoidable environmental impact.

CEQA requires that alternatives to the project be assessed. Three alternatives to the proposed GPU were selected for analysis. The goal for evaluating any of these alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the GPU. These are described below:

- **Alternative 1—No Build (Zero Growth under Existing General Plan)**—Under this alternative, no future development would occur through 2035 under the existing General Plan (1993) and the GPU would not take place. Therefore, all potential environmental impacts would be the same as existing conditions. This alternative allows decision-makers to assess the impacts of approving the GPU with the impacts of not approving the GPU based on existing conditions and not approving any subsequent development proposals. The alternative reduces impacts overall when compared to the GPU because there would be no more development. However, under this alternative, no aesthetic, trails, recreation, alternative transportation facilities, or transportation management systems benefits would result, as the proposed goals and policies related to these items in the GPU would not be implemented.
- **Alternative 2—No Project/Existing General Plan (1993) Buildout**—Under this alternative, all future development would occur according to the existing General Plan (1993). This is the “No Project” alternative, since no legislative changes would be required, and the 1993 General Plan would continue to be in effect. It is assumed that the buildout would occur by 2035. Because the current General Plan allows for more development overall in the City than the proposed GPU (see PART 2. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE) the impacts are generally greater than the proposed GPU.
- **Alternative 3—Reduced Density**—As previously discussed, project-related traffic impacts along 16 roadway segments cannot practically be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. It was considered that a less intensive development plan may help to reduce these impacts. Under Alternative 3, development within portions of TAZs 6, 8, 10, and 12 was generally reduced by 25 percent. These TAZs were selected as targeted reduction areas due to the amount of existing and projected traffic that occurs or would

occur within the TAZ. A portion of the development in Subarea 5, which is located in TAZ 8, was reduced. In addition, reduced traffic tends to generate less air and noise pollution. The result was that the traffic impacts and air and noise impacts were slightly lessened. Alternative 3 is considered the “environmentally superior alternative,” when compared to the other two alternatives and the proposed GPU. However, it does not fully meet the objectives of the General Plan Update, as it reduces economic development opportunities.

As mentioned in PART 2: GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, the GPU substantially lowers the amount of residential and non-residential development at buildout, when compared to the existing General Plan (1993). The GPU buildout scenario was created to be a more realistic development scenario for 2035, allowing some future development and flexibility for additions to existing buildings. Alternative 3 would further reduce the amount of development that would be ultimately allowed, thereby reducing potential flexibility for new development, and additions to existing development, and so reducing potential economic vitality and viability of the City for the future.