Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

May 9, 2007

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT (T2007-00002)
RELATING TO THE SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA
COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT
THE MALIBU ZONED DISTRICT
THIRD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3 VOTES)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Consider the attached Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration;

2. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission as reflected in the attached draft ordinance amending the provisions of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District applicable to local-serving businesses, and determine that it is compatible with and supportive of the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the County's Strategic Plan;

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance to amend the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District of the Los Angeles County Code as recommended by the Commission and include any changes by the Board.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District was adopted in September 2002, along with a zoning consistency program, as part of the implementation measures for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. It was recently discovered that the zone changes associated with the implementation of the North Area Plan inadvertently caused a local-serving business to become nonconforming. It was not the intent of the North Area Plan or its associated zone changes to eliminate lawfully-established, local-serving businesses appropriately located within the North Area. This amendment is needed to ensure that local-serving businesses which inadvertently may have been made nonconforming by zone changes associated with the adoption of the North Area Plan, can continue to serve residents during emergencies and at other times, that they are allowed to expand their services, and that any such expansions are compatible with the surrounding community and consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment promotes the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence. The proposed amendment has been carefully researched and analyzed to ensure that it is protective of public health and safety and the environment and responsive to public concerns. Establishing a clear set of rules and ensuring efficiency in the County's zoning code promotes Service Excellence.

The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment also promotes the County's vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The Santa Monica Mountains North Area is primarily a rural area whose residents are spread throughout the Mountains. The proposed CSD amendment will help to ensure that local-serving businesses remain in close proximity to these residents in order to serve them during emergencies and at other times. Additionally, one of the main goals of the CSD is to protect the natural environment throughout the North Area. This amendment facilitates this goal by establishing regulations so that any expansion of local-serving businesses must be consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan and compatible with surrounding land uses. The amendment therefore contributes to the improvement of the quality of life in Los Angeles County by allowing lawfully-established local-serving businesses to be in close proximity to their customers during emergencies and other times, and by adding provisions to protect the natural environment in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area for the benefit of all County residents.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Implementation of the proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment will not result in any significant new costs to the Department of Regional Planning or other County departments. The proposed CSD amendment requires a conditional use permit for any physical expansion of the business. Conditional use permits require fees that are intended to recover the full cost for services provided in reviewing, evaluating, and monitoring projects. Implementation of the North Area CSD amendment will not result in additional net County costs and, therefore, a request for financing is not being made at this time.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

On its meeting held May 30, 2006, your Board directed the Acting Director of Planning to review the impact of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan on local-serving businesses, to recommend appropriate zoning actions to allow these essential local-serving businesses to continue and expand, and to ensure that such uses are compatible with the surrounding community. This proposed amendment addresses your directive.

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment on March 28, 2007. The request before the Commission was to approve the proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District amendment. The Regional Planning Commission voted to approve the proposed amendment at this meeting and directed that the amendment be transmitted to your Board for consideration.

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Section 65856 of the Government Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

In compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles, the Department of Regional Planning prepared an addendum to the negative declaration adopted for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District. CEQA Section 15164 (b) states that "an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or

none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." A negative declaration was prepared for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD. This negative declaration, adopted on October 23, 2001, contemplated commercial uses in the North Area. The uses to be allowed under the proposed amendment are existing uses that were already considered in the original negative declaration. After preparing an Initial Study, staff determined that no new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified effects will occur as a result of this amendment; no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the uses are undertaken; and no new information of substantial importance is available which was not previously discussed in the negative declaration. Therefore, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 have occurred and no subsequent EIR or negative declaration is required. Based on these findings, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared an addendum to the adopted negative declaration, pursuant to CEQA Section 15164. The addendum describes the purpose, contents, and effects of the amendment to the CSD, as well as the locations where the provisions will apply. The addendum was made available for public review from February 26 to March 27, 2007, and is attached to the original adopted negative declaration.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES

Approval of the proposed North Area CSD amendment will improve planning services to applicants who own lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming, by allowing them to continue in a conforming status with no further action required. It also provides a procedure through which such businesses can expand their buildings and structures, through the already-existing conditional use permit process.

It is not anticipated that any additional Regional Planning staff members will be necessary to process conditional use permits associated with the expansion of these businesses.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment is necessary to allow lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to continue and expand. The CSD amendment will streamline planning services by allowing businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to continue as conforming, and will ensure that these businesses are compatible with the surrounding community by requiring a conditional use permit for any physical expansion. The advantages of this amendment include: simplicity – no need for businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to take any further action to continue operating in a conforming status; efficiency – utilizing the already-existing conditional use permit process to regulate the expansion of such businesses; consistency – with County operating

procedures, the County of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, and; certainty – affected businesses are able to continue operation without interruption.

If you have any questions regarding the proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD amendment, please contact Gina M. Natoli of my staff at (213) 974-6422. Ms. Natoli may also be reached at gnatoli@planning.lacounty.gov.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Bruce W. McClendon, FAICP
Director of Planning

BWM:GMN:VS

Attachments:

1. Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission
2. Project Summary
3. Proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD Amendment
4. Summary of RPC Proceedings
5. Environmental Documents
6. Legal Notice of Board Hearing
7. List of Persons to be Notified

C: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Director, Department of Public Works

RESOLUTION

THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, The Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a public hearing on March 28, 2007 on the matter of an amendment to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code, relating to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD), and

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. On October 24, 2000, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan.

2. The North Area Plan directed the Department of Regional Planning to undertake several actions, including a zoning consistency program and creating a community standards district, critical for implementation.

3. Several parcels in commercial and manufacturing land use categories were changed to non-commercial and non-manufacturing land use categories and/or zoning with the adoption of the North Area Plan and its associated zone changes.

4. Implementation of zone changes associated with the North Area Plan and adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z inadvertently caused at least one lawfully-established local-serving business to become nonconforming.

5. It is in the interest of public health, safety, and welfare to ensure that local-serving businesses are sited near their customers in order to respond to emergencies and at other times.

6. The North Area Plan supports local-serving businesses sited in appropriate locations.

7. It was not the intent of the North Area Plan or its associated zone changes to eliminate lawfully-established local-serving businesses appropriately located within the North Area.

8. A need for the proposed standards exists in order to allow local-serving businesses, lawfully established prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue.

9. It is sometimes necessary for businesses to extend, expand or enlarge in order to effectively continue operation and provide customer service. The proposed standards will allow those lawfully-established local-serving businesses made nonconforming by Ordinance 2002-0062Z to extend, expand, or enlarge their area of land, building, or structure under certain conditions.

10. The proposed standards are necessary at this time because at least one lawfully-established local-serving business is unable to expand and provide complete service to its customers due to its nonconforming status, and other local-serving businesses and customers may be similarly affected.

11. The proposed standards will ensure that any extension, expansion, or enlargement of the subject business is compatible with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan and will not adversely affect surrounding residents.

12. A Negative Declaration was adopted for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD. An Initial Study was prepared for this project, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that, in light of the whole record before the Commission, no new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously-identified effects will occur as a result of this amendment; no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the uses are undertaken; and no new information of substantial importance is available which was not previously discussed in the Negative Declaration. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning prepared an addendum to the Negative Declaration for the CSD.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Regional Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board of Supervisors hold a public hearing to consider the recommended amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD.

2. That the Board of Supervisors find the recommended amendment is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

3. That the Board of Supervisors find that the public safety, the public convenience, the general welfare and good planning practice justify implementing the policies of the North Area Plan.

4. That the Board of Supervisors adopt the above recommended amendment, allowing legally-established local-serving businesses to continue in a conforming status and adding a heightened level of review for expansion of such businesses.

5. That the Board of Supervisors certify the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Santa Monica Mountains CSD, and find that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on February 28, 2007.

Rosie O. Ruiz

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:	Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District Local-Serving Businesses Amendment.
REQUEST:	Adopt the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD) Amendment.
LOCATION:	Santa Monica Mountains North Area (Third Supervisorial District).
STAFF CONTACT:	Ms. Gina M. Natoli, AICP, at (213) 974-6422.
RPC HEARING DATE:	March 28, 2007
RPC RECOMMENDATIONS TO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:	• Hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD. • Find that the amendment is consistent with the goals, policies, and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan. • Find that public safety, public convenience, general welfare, and good planning practice justify implementing the policies of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (Plan). • Adopt the recommended amendment allowing legally-established local-serving businesses to continue in a conforming status and adding a heightened level of review for the physical expansion of such businesses. • Certify the Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD, and find that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Valadez, Bellamy, Rew, and Modugno.
MEMBERS VOTING NAY:	None.
MEMBERS NOT VOTING:	Helsley (absent).
KEY ISSUES:	The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District was adopted in October 2001, along with a zoning consistency program, as part of the implementation measures for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. It was recently discovered that the zone changes associated with the implementation of the Plan caused a lawfully-established local-serving business to become nonconforming. It was not the

intent of the North Area Plan or its associated zone changes to eliminate lawfully-established local serving businesses appropriately located within the North Area.

The proposed amendment is needed to ensure that these businesses can continue to serve residents during emergencies and at other times. The amendment also ensures that the natural environment and neighborhood character are protected by establishing a heightened level of review for the expansion of such businesses. Any expansion of the building or structure of said businesses would require approval of a conditional use permit. Applicants for such permits must substantiate that the use was lawfully established and in conformance with all applicable laws and ordinances prior to September 19, 2002, that the expanded use is consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan, and that it is a local-serving business that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

MAJOR POINTS FOR:

The amendment:

- Allows lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to continue in order to serve residents during emergencies and at other times.
- Establishes heightened environmental review for the expansion of such businesses in order to protect public health, safety, and welfare and the natural environment.
- Clarifies the conditions under which such businesses are allowed to continue and the requirements for them to expand their buildings or structures.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST:

- None received.

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT AMENDMENT ORDINANCE

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An Ordinance amending Title 22.44.133 Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to add a provision to Community-wide Development Standards.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 22.44.133 D. Community-wide Development Standards is amended to read as follows:

...

7. Local-serving businesses.

a. Local-serving businesses and associated buildings and structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to September 19, 2002, and which became nonconforming as a result of the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, are not subject to the provisions of Part 10 of Chapter 22.56. Such uses, buildings, and structures may continue as long as the use does not change. If the use is discontinued for a period of two or more years, any new use on the parcel will then become subject to the provisions of Part 10 of Chapter 22.56 and must conform to the North Area Plan land use category and designated zoning.

b. A conditional use permit shall be required for:

i. Any extension, expansion, or enlargement of the area of land, or the area within a building or structure requiring a building permit;

ii. Alteration, enlargement of, or addition to a building or structure requiring a building permit; or,

iii. Addition of land, buildings, or structures used in conjunction with the use, building, or structure.

c. In addition to the information required by Section 22.56.030, the applicant for a conditional use permit must provide proof that the use, building, or structure was lawfully established prior to September 19, 2002.

d. In addition to the information required by Section 22.56.040, the applicant for a conditional use permit shall substantiate that the proposed expansion:

i. Is consistent with the goals and policies of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan; and

ii. Is a local-serving business use that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEEDINGS
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA
COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT AMENDMENT

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing on March 28, 2007 to consider the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD) amendment. The proposed amendment allows lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming by the adoption of zone changes associated with the implementation of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, to continue in a conforming status. The amendment also establishes a heightened level of review for the physical expansion of such businesses. Located in the Third Supervisorial District, the Santa Monica Mountains North Area is the unincorporated area west of the City of Los Angeles, east of Ventura County, and north of the coastal zone boundary.

Notice of public hearing was published in local newspapers and notices were sent to every property owner in the North Area whose property was zoned as commercial or manufacturing under the previous land use plan for the area (Santa Monica Mountains Interim Area Plan), and under the current Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. Notices were also sent to owners of property within 500 feet of these properties, as well as to those individuals and organizations on the Department's Santa Monica Mountains North Area courtesy mailing list. The draft CSD amendment, staff report, Initial Study, and addendum to the Negative Declaration were available for review at the following locations:

- Dept. of Regional Planning website:http://planning.lacounty.gov/spSmmnap.htm
- Dept. of Regional Planning office: Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1356, Los Angeles, CA
- Los Angeles County One Stop Center: 26600 Agoura Road 110, Calabasas, CA
- Calabasas Public Library: 23975 Park Sorrento, Calabasas, CA
- Agoura Hills Public Library: 29901 Ladyface Court, Agoura Hills, CA
- Westlake Village Public Library: 31220 Oak Crest Drive, Westlake Village, CA
- Resource Conservation District: 30000 Mulholland Highway, Agoura, CA

March 28, 2007

Staff presented the proposed CSD amendment to the Commission for its review. The Commission held a brief discussion and then opened the public hearing. No testimony was received from the public. The Commission approved the proposed CSD amendment on a vote of 4-0 (one commissioner absent) and directed staff to transmit the amendment to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

ADDENDUM TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: T2007-00002

1. DESCRIPTION:

An amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District. The amendment is being undertaken to return pre-existing lawfully-established local-serving businesses, which were inadvertently made nonconforming with the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to conforming status. This is necessary to ensure that service providers remain in close proximity to their customers during emergencies and other times. The amendment does not authorize any new uses or any development more intense than was allowed under the previous zoning. The amendment also adds provisions to ensure that the uses, buildings, and structures are in conformance with the goals and policies of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, that they are local-serving, and that they are compatible with surrounding land uses, by requiring approval of a conditional use permit for any physical expansion of the business.

2. LOCATION:

Parcels scattered throughout the area of the Santa Monica Mountains west of the City of Los Angeles and north of the coastal zone boundary, with concentrations along Mulholland Highway at the intersections with Cornell Road, Troutdale Drive, and Cornell School Road; Topanga Canyon Boulevard between Santa Maria Road and Cheney Drive; the intersection of Las Virgenes Road and Brittany Court; the intersection of Agoura Road and Liberty Canyon Road; and north of the Ventura Freeway (US-101) west of Parkway Calabasas.

3. PROPONENT:

County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL REQUIRE ONLY MINOR TECHNICAL CHANGES TO THE ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CSD AND WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. THEREFORE, AN ADDENDUM HAS BEEN PREPARED PERSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15164.

5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS ADENDUM IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Veronica Siranosian
DATE: February 21, 2007

ADDENDUM
TO THE
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
AND
INITIAL STUDY

SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA
COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT AMENDMENT

Local-Serving Businesses Ordinance

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012

February 21, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 3

1.1 BACKGROUND 3

1.1.1 Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan and the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District 4

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE 4

1.2.1 Use of an Addendum to a Previously Adopted Negative Declaration 4

1.3 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE INITIAL STUDY 6

1.4 EXISTING DOCUMENTS TO BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE 6

1.5 CONTACT PERSON 7

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 7

2.1 INTRODUCTION 7

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING 7

2.2.1 Location 7

2.2.2 Physical Features 8

2.2.3 Characteristics of Existing land Uses Within Unincorporated Area 8

2.2.4 Characteristics of Existing Land Uses Within Adjacent Communities 8

2.3 ORDINANCE DESCRIPTION 8

2.3.1 Specific Provisions of the Proposed Ordinance 8

2.3.2 General Effects of the Proposed Ordinance 9

3.0 INITIAL STUDY 10

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM 10

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines, Los Angeles County is the Lead Agency, and is charged with the responsibility of deciding whether or not to approve the proposed project, a local-serving businesses ordinance, which is an amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to allow local-serving uses, buildings, and structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to the adoption of the zone changes associated with implementation of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, which became nonconforming as a result of the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue as long as the use does not change. This document evaluates the potential environmental effects of the proposed Local-Serving Businesses Ordinance, and determines the appropriate form of environmental documentation pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (Plan) was adopted on October 24, 2000 to provide a more focused policy for the regulation of development within the unincorporated area of the Santa Monica Mountains north of the coastal zone.

The Plan directed the Department of Regional Planning to prepare a zoning consistency program and community standards district (CSD) to implement the Plan. Zone changes were made to ensure that zoning was consistent with the adopted plan, per the requirements of California Government Code Section 65860.

Recently, it was discovered that zone changes that took place with the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z inadvertently caused a lawfully-established local-serving business to become nonconforming. In order to ensure that local-serving businesses are able to continue to serve residents during emergencies and other times, on May 30, 2006 the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors instructed the Acting Director of Planning to carry out the following activities:

1. To review the impact of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan on local-serving professional, repair and maintenance services;
2. To recommend appropriate zoning actions to allow these essential local-serving businesses to continue and expand; and
3. To ensure that the uses are compatible with the surrounding community.

The proposed ordinance will amend the CSD to allow such local-serving business uses, buildings, and structures to continue.

1.1.1 Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan and the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District

The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan contains goals and policies to guide the regulation of development within the unincorporated area of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area. The North Area Plan refines the policies of the County-wide General Plan as it applies to the North Area.

The Community Standards District is a means of implementing the goals and policies of the Plan in a manner that protects the health, safety, and welfare of the community, especially the surrounding natural environment. The CSD includes community-wide development standards intended to preserve the area's natural environment and ensure that new development is compatible with the existing communities. These standards address issues that affect the entire North Area and serve to provide continuity and uniformity throughout the community.

1.1.2 Previous Environmental Documentation

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted the Final Negative Declaration (Neg Dec) for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD on October 23, 2001. The Neg Dec determined that development allowed pursuant to the CSD would have no adverse impacts because the CSD set forth development standards intended to protect the natural environment. Based on the Initial Study for the CSD, it was determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, an Initial Study has been prepared in order to determine whether amending the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to adopt the Local-Serving Businesses Ordinance would result in significant new or substantially more severe environmental impacts than were addressed in the Negative Declaration for the CSD that would require the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report (EIR) or negative declaration.

This Initial Study includes an analysis of the provisions of Section 15162 and Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study examines whether the Negative Declaration adequately addresses the impacts associated with implementation of the proposed amendment.

1.2.1 Use of an Addendum to a Previously-Adopted Negative Declaration

Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines states that an addendum to an EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared "if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines identify

the conditions that require preparation of a subsequent EIR. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a), a proposed change in a project will require preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration if:

1. *The change in the project is substantial.* Substantial changes in the project are those that would require "major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects."
2. *The circumstances under which the project is undertaken have substantially changed.* Substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken are defined as those that would "require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects."
3. *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known, with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*
   A. "The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
   B. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
   C. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   D. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (b), "if changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under *subdivision* (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation."

If none of the conditions set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 subdivisions (a) or (b) have occurred, the County may require preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration, or an Addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary, or the County may decide that no further environmental documentation is necessary.

This Initial Study relies on use of an Environmental Checklist Form (Form), as suggested in Section 15063 (d) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines. The Form is used:

- To evaluate whether or not there are any new or more severe significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project; and
- To review whether there is new information or circumstances that would require preparation of additional environmental documentation or if an addendum is appropriate.

Section 3.0 of this document contains the Checklist Form and explains the basis for each response to the questions on the Form.

1.3 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE INITIAL STUDY

The project description contained in Chapter 2.0 of the Initial Study and each of the issues contained in the checklist presented in Section 3.0 of this document have been evaluated. Based on CEQA Guidelines, the County determined that an addendum to the Neg Dec for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area CSD would be the appropriate CEQA document. With only minor changes, the Initial Study addresses the impacts associated with the proposed ordinance. The only impacts that were found to result from the proposed ordinance were identified as less than significant in the Initial Study. In addition, it was found that the impacts of the proposed ordinance would be no more severe than was found in the Initial Study. Based on this analysis and the information contained herein, there is no evidence that the proposed project requires the preparation of a subsequent Neg Dec or environmental impact report.

1.4 EXISTING DOCUMENTS TO BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines permits an environmental document to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data.

The documents outlined in this section are hereby incorporated by reference – and the pertinent material is summarized throughout this Initial Study/Addendum – where that information is relevant to the analysis of impacts of the project. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

- Negative Declaration for the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District, adopted October 23, 2001.

1.5 CONTACT PERSON

The Lead Agency for the Initial Study for the amendment is Los Angeles County. Any questions about the preparation of this Initial Study, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Gina M. Natoli, AICP
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-642

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The proposed Ordinance amends the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to address the existence of lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming with the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z. The amendment will apply only to those local-serving businesses that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to September 19, 2002, as long as the use does not change. The provision is intended to ensure that local-serving businesses are in close proximity to their customers during emergencies and other times.

The proposed project requires the following approval by Los Angeles County:

- Adoption of an ordinance amending the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to allow local-serving business uses, buildings, and structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to the adoption of zone changes associated with implementation of the North Area Plan, which became nonconforming as a result of the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue as long as the use does not change.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

2.2.1 Location

The area covered by the North Area Plan is located approximately 27 miles west of downtown Los Angeles between Ventura County on the north and west, the City of Los Angeles on the east, and the coastal zone on the South, excluding the cities of Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas and Hidden Hills. The parcels potentially affected by the proposed amendment are scattered throughout the area, with concentrations along Mulholland Highway at the intersections with Cornell Road, Troutdale Drive, and Cornell School Road; Topanga Canyon Boulevard between Santa Maria Road and

Cheney Drive; the intersection of Las Virgenes Road and Brittany Court; the intersection of Agoura Road and Liberty Canyon Road; and north of the Ventura Freeway (US-101) west of Parkway Calabasas.

2.2.2 Physical Features

The topography of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment consists mainly of relatively flat lands, with some rolling and moderately steep hills. No perennial streams run through the parcels potentially affected by the amendment.

2.2.3 Characteristics of Existing land Uses Within Unincorporated Area

The existing land uses of the subject properties include Rural Residential, Mountain Lands, and Commercial. These land use categories generally consist of low-density single-family detached housing in rural areas; rolling hillside areas, steep slopes, and isolated mountain lands; and general shopping and commercial areas that serve the needs of residents, workers, highway users, and tourists.

2.2.4 Characteristics of Existing Land Uses Within Adjacent Communities

The parcels potentially affected by this amendment are located throughout the area covered by the Plan. The existing uses of the surrounding properties vary, but can generally be categorized as follows:

- Mainly undeveloped open spaces, including publicly-owned lands,
- Hillside and mountain areas with limited residential and commercial development,
- Low-density single-family residential and some rural residential areas,
- Areas for general shopping and commercial services, and
- Areas designated to provide for major transportation facilities.

2.3 ORDINANCE DESCRIPTION

2.3.1 Specific Provisions of the Proposed Ordinance

As previously stated, the proposed project consists of an amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to allow local-serving business uses, buildings, and structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to the adoption of the zone changes associated with implementation of the North Area Plan, which became nonconforming as a result of the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue as long as the use does not change. The proposed Ordinance would add the following provision to the CSD:

- *Local-serving businesses and associated structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to September 19, 2002, and which became nonconforming as a result of the*

adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, are not subject to the provisions of Part 10 of Chapter 22.56. Such uses, buildings, and structures may continue as long as the use does not change. If the use is discontinued for a period of two years or more, any new use on the parcel will then become subject to the provisions of Part 10 of Chapter 22.56 and must conform to the North Area Plan land use category and designated zoning.

The proposed ordinance would not authorize additional uses or a change in use. It only applies to those businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming with the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z. These uses, buildings, and structures are only considered conforming if the use does not change.

- *A conditional use permit shall be required for any extension, expansion, or enlargement of the area of land, or the area within a building or structure requiring a building permit; alteration, enlargement of, or addition to a building or structure requiring a building permit; or addition of land, buildings or structures used in conjunction with the use, building, or structure. In addition to the information required by Section 22.56.030, the applicant must provide proof that the business use or structure was lawfully established prior to September 19, 2002.*

Lawfully-established local-serving businesses are allowed to continue as long as the use does not change. Business owners are allowed to expand their use, building, or structure, however, any such action requires the approval of a conditional use permit. Applicants for such permits must prove the business was lawfully established prior to the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z.

- *In addition to the information required by Section 22.56.040, the applicant shall substantiate that the proposed expansion is consistent with the goals and policies of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan and that it is a local-serving use that is compatible with surrounding land uses.*

The proposed ordinance will require that applicants for conditional use permits substantiate that the expansion of the use, building, or structure is consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan and is a local-serving business use that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

2.3.2 General Effects of the Proposed Ordinance

The proposed ordinance will apply to parcels throughout the North Area where a local-serving business was lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws, and which was inadvertently made nonconforming with the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z. The proposed ordinance does not modify any of the land use designations or zoning boundaries set forth in the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan. Therefore, the proposed ordinance does not modify or affect the type or mix of planned land uses that are allowed to develop pursuant to the North Area Plan and

CSD. Additionally, the proposed ordinance does not authorize any changes in existing uses or any intensification of new development where none was previously authorized. It only restores lawfully-established, existing uses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to conforming status. It also requires a conditional use permit for any extension, expansion, or enlargement of the area of land, or the area within a building or structure requiring a building permit; alteration, enlargement of, or addition to a building or structure requiring a building permit; or addition of land, buildings, or structures used in conjunction with the use, building, or structure. This is meant to ensure that certain changes to the business use or structure(s) made conforming by the amendment are consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan and are compatible with surrounding land uses. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the amendment therefore qualifies as a minor change.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

The following pages contain the Environmental Checklist Form (Form) for the proposed project. The Form is marked with findings as to the environmental effects of the project. A checked box (■) in one of the first four columns indicates the need to prepare additional environmental analysis in the form of a supplemental or subsequent EIR. If all of the checked boxes fall in the last two columns, preparation of a mitigated negative declaration, a negative declaration, or an addendum will be required.

As explained in Section 1.0, this analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, to provide the factual basis for determining, based on the information available, the form of environmental documentation the project warrants. The basis for each of the findings listed in the attached Form is explained in the text following the checklist.

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *Not Applicable*
CASES:

* * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *Not Applicable*
Staff Member: *Siranosian, Veronica*
Thomas Guide: *557-560 and 586-590*
USGS Quad: *Thousand Oaks, Calabasas, Canoga Park, Malibu Beach, Point Dume, Topanga*
Location: *Parcels scattered throughout the unincorporated area of the Santa Monica Mountains west of the City of Los Angeles and north of the Coastal Zone boundary, with concentrations along Mulholland Highway at the intersections with Cornell Road, Troutdale Drive, and Cornell School Road; Topanga Canyon Boulevard between Santa Maria Road and Cheney Drive; the intersection of Las Virgenes Road and Brittany Court; the intersection of Agoura Road and Liberty Canyon Road; and north of the Ventura Freeway (US-101) west of Parkway Calabasas.*

Description of Project: *An amendment to the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District allowing local-serving uses, buildings, and structures that were lawfully established and in compliance with all applicable ordinances and laws prior to the adoption of the zone changes associated with implementation of the North Area Plan, which became nonconforming as a result of the adoption of Ordinance 2002-0062Z, to continue as long as the use does not change. The provision also specifies that approval of a conditional use permit is required for any expansion of the business.*

Gross Acres: *209*

Environmental Setting: *The topography of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment consists mainly of relatively flat lands, with some rolling and moderately steep hills. No perennial streams run through the parcels potentially affected by the amendment.*

Zoning: *R-1, A-1, O-S, R-R*

General Plan: *Non-urban, Open Space, Rural Communities, Significant Ecological Area*

Community/Area wide Plan: *OS, OS-P, OS-DR, N20, N10, N5, N2, N1*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
Not Applicable	

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☑ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☑ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☑ CA Dept. of Transportation
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☑ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☑ None
- ☑ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☑ City of Agoura Hills
- ☑ City of Calabasas
- ☑ City of Hidden Hills
- ☑ City of Los Angeles
- ☑ City of Malibu
- ☑ City of Westlake Village
- ☑ County of Ventura
- ☑ California State University, Fullerton
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☐ None
- ☑ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☑ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☐ DPW:
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX			ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
			Less than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR			
				New Information Showing Ability to Reduce Effects		
					New Information Showing Greater Significant Effect	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				Change Requiring Major EIR Revisions
HAZARDS	**1. Geotechnical**	**5**	☑	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	**6**	☑	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	**7**	☑	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	**8**	☑	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	**1. Water Quality**	**9**	☑	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	**10**	☑	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	**11**	☑	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	**12**	☑	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	**13**	☑	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	**14**	☑	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	**15**	☑	☐	☐	
SERVICES	**1. Traffic/Access**	**16**	☑	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	**17**	☑	☐	☐	
	3. Education	**18**	☑	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	**19**	☑	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	**20**	☑	☐	☐	
OTHER	**1. General**	**21**	☑	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	**22**	☑	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	**23**	☑	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	**24**	☑	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	**25**	☑	☐	☐	

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: ***Applicable only to individual development projects.***

2. ☑ **Yes** ☐ **No** **Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?**

3. ☐ **Yes** ☑ **No** **Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?**

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ **Check if DMS printout generated (attached)**

Date of printout: _____

☐ **Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)**

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: **On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:**

☑ **ADDENDUM TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project is a minor technical change or addition to the adopted Community Standards District.**

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that none of the conditions described in CEQA Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration exist.

☐ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.**

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).**

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".**

☐ **At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.**

Reviewed by: _____ **Date:** _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Approved by: Gina M. Natoli **Date:** _____

☐ **Determination appealed – see attached sheet.**

***NOTE:** **Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.**

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
d. Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
e. Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■

DISCUSSION

The topography of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment consists mainly of relatively flat lands, with some rolling and moderately steep hills. Some of the parcels potentially affected are in landslide or liquefaction zones. No fault traces cross the subject parcels and no parcels are located in seismic zones.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
d. Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

A few of the subject parcels contain major drainage courses. A few of the subject parcels contain 100-year floodplains.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

All of the parcels potentially affected by the amendment are located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

Some of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment are near the Ventura Freeway (US-101).

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The subject parcels may use onsite wastewater treatment systems. A few of these parcels are located in close proximity to drainage courses.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
h. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The proposed amendment does not authorize new development in an area where it was not previously allowed.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
d. Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
e. Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
f. Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
g. Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐

DISCUSSION

The subject parcels contain portions of SEA Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12. No construction is proposed as part of the project. The subject parcels contain many waterways throughout portions of the Malibu Creek watershed. The parcels also contain Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest, Southern Riparian Forest, Valley Needlegrass Grassland, and Valley Oak Woodland. Other native trees on the parcels are Coast live oak, valley oak, western sycamore, southern California black walnut, and California juniper. The project site is a habitat for southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, pallid bat, golden eagle, coastal western whiptail, Braunton's milk-vetch, burrowing owl, round-leaved flaree, slender mariposa lily, Plummer's mariposa lily, monarch butterfly, San Bernardino ringneck snake, Agoura Hills dudleya, Santa Monica Mountains dudleya, southwestern pond turtle, spotted bat, western mastiff bat, California mountain kingsnake, San Diego desert woodrat, Lyon's pentachaeta, Coast horned lizard, coastal California gnatcatcher, two-striped garter snake, Sonoran maiden fern, and Santa Monica grasshopper. The subject parcels are also part of the Liberty Canyon wildlife corridor.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ **Lot Size** ☐ **Project Design** ☐ **Oak Tree Permit** ■ **ERB/SEATAC Review**

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

Natural features that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity are found on some of the subject parcels. There is an indication of potential paleontological resources due to geologic features on some of the subject parcels. None of the parcels potentially affected by this amendment are registered as historic-cultural monuments.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

NOT APPLICABLE

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

There are no known mineral resources affected by the project.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

None of the subject parcels contain or border prime or unique farmland and none is designated as being of statewide or local importance.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

Several parcels potentially affected by the amendment are located along Mulholland Highway, a state-designated County Scenic Highway. A few of the parcels are visible from segments of the Topanga-Henry Ridge Trail (proposed), Backbone Trail, Saddleback Trail (proposed), and the Calabasas-Cold Creek Trail (proposed). A few parcels have proposed trail routes within their boundaries. None of the subject properties contains unique aesthetic features. A 35 foot height limit will ensure that projects on the subject properties are not out-of-character with adjacent uses, and will not create substantial sun, shadow, light, or glare problems.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
d. Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
e. Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Other factors? Change of primary access	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The amendment will allow expansion of the subject businesses, potentially contributing to traffic/access problems. Such expansions will require approval of a conditional use permit to ensure that the proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

Some of the subject parcels will be on sewers. The amendment will allow expansion of the businesses, which may impact sewage disposal systems. Any such expansion will require approval of a conditional use permit to ensure that the proposed site is served by public or private service facilities as are required.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Could the project create student transportation problems?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The amendment is concerned with local-serving businesses, and does not impact school enrollment or increase population.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The project does not increase the number of possible local-serving businesses. Extensions, expansions, or enlargements of the land, building, or structure will require a conditional use permit to ensure that such changes do not jeopardize public health, safety, and general welfare. The parcels potentially affected by the amendment are all located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The project does not increase the number of local-serving businesses and requires that any extension, expansions, or enlargement of the land, building, or structure is consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan and that the use is local-serving and consistent with the goals and policies of the North Area Plan.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
b. Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
d. Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
h. Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
i. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
j. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The amendment allows local-serving businesses to continue and expand. Some of these businesses may involve hazardous materials.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:						
Hillside Management Criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
SEA Conformance Criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
Other?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Would the project physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
e. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The amendment is being proposed because some uses were inadvertently made inconsistent with the implementation of Ordinance 2002-0062Z. The allowable local-serving businesses are consistent with the Plan's land use policy map.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
d. Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	■	☐
e. Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
f. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
g. Other factors?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

The project includes the potential expansion of use, building, or structure, which could effect employment. Local-serving businesses were already considered in the Neg. Dec. to the CSD, and were found to have a less than significant impact. This amendment will not allow any uses more intense than what was previously allowed or any increase of the number of possible businesses, so there is no change or new information regarding employment that would require preparation of an EIR. Since the project will allow service providers to be closer to customers, VMT would likely decrease rather than increase.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ■ Addendum EIR/ND ☐ No Additional Analysis

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

SETTING/IMPACTS	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Greater Significant Effects than Previous EIR(s)	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce, but Not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR(s)	Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
b. Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■
c. Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	■

DISCUSSION

The project does not allow new uses on previously-vacant land.

CONCLUSION

☐ Subsequent/Supplemental EIR ☐ Addendum EIR/ND ■ No Additional Analysis

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
PROPOSED
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NORTH AREA
COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT AMENDMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regional Planning Commission, County of Los Angeles has recommended approval of the proposed Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD) amendment. The amendment will allow lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming by the adoption of zone changes associated with the implementation of the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan, to continue and to expand where appropriate with a conditional use permit. The proposed CSD amendment is necessary to ensure that these local-serving businesses can continue to serve residents during emergencies and at other times.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing will be held before the Board of Supervisors, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 at 9:30 a.m. on _____ pursuant to said Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code and Title 7 of the California Government Code (Planning and Zoning Law) for the purpose of hearing testimony relative to the adoption of the following:

- Proposed modifications to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance), amending the Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District to allow lawfully-established local-serving businesses that were inadvertently made nonconforming to continue and, where appropriate, expand upon approval of a conditional use permit.

All interested persons will be heard at the public hearing.

Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please call Ms. Gina M. Natoli, AICP, at (213) 974-6422.

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles, an Initial Study was prepared for the this amendment. Based on the Initial Study, staff concluded that the appropriate environmental document for the amendment is an addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration for the CSD. The addendum describes the purpose, contents, and effects of the amendment to the CSD, as well as the locations where the provisions will apply. The addendum will also be considered at the Public Hearing.

ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: Assistive listening devices, agenda in Braille and/or alternate formats are available upon request. American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters, other auxiliary aids and services, or reasonable modifications to Board meeting policies and/or procedures, such as to assist members of the disability community who would like to request a disability-related accommodation in addressing the Board, are available if requested at least three business days prior to the Board meeting. Later requests will be accommodated to the extend feasible. Please telephone the Executive Office of the Board at (213) 974-1431 (voice) or (213) 974-1707 (TTY), from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Máquinas de traducción disponibles a petición.

Interpretes par alas juntas de los Supervisores del Condado de Los Angeles, favor llamar al (213) 974-1405 entre las horas de 8:00 a.m. a 5:00 p.m., lunes a viernes, con tres dias de anticipación.

Si no entiende esta noticia o necesita mas información, por favor llame este numero: (213) 974-6466.

SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER-CLERK OF
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS