General Plan Update Process

Four Phases over 21 months

- **Phase 1:** Public outreach, assessment, and land use alternatives development
- **Phase 2:** General Plan Policy/Element Development
- **Phase 3:** General Plan Update Completion
- **Phase 4:** Development Code Update
Community Input & Feedback Tools

- 17 GPAC meetings (including 4 meetings beyond original work scope)
- Two public workshops
- Two-Day visioning charrette
- Community telephone survey
- Stakeholder discussions/interviews
- HOA presidents’ briefing
- Fourth of July booth
- City website
Draft General Plan
### General Plan Reorganization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Conservation, Environmental Design, Open Space</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Environmental Hazards</th>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>General Plan Implementation Programs</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 General Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Glossary
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan

Land Use Element

• Land Use Map
  – 306 additional acres designated as open space (OS-R or OS-RP)
  – 120 acres re-designated from B-R (Business-Retail) to MU (Mixed Use)
  – New PD (Planned Development) designation for two key sites along Las Virgenes Road

• Increased focus on “compact” development
Why Compact Development?

- Protects natural resources, hillsides, open space, and views
- Revitalizes commercial districts with mixed uses, emphasis on pedestrian character, and creation of a “sense of place”
- Reduces vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled & greenhouse gas emissions
- Complies with new law (SB 375) currently contemplated by Legislature
  - Would require SCAG to create land use/transportation plans encouraging “smart growth”
  - Would give local agencies complying with regional plans priority for state transportation funds
Current v. GPAC-Recommended Map Land Use Breakdown*

Current Land Use Map

- Business/Commercial: 32%
- Mixed Use: 4%
- Open Space: 37%
- Public Facilities: 3%
- Rural Residential: 22%
- Urban Residential: 3%

Draft Land Use Map

- Business/Commercial: 32%
- Mixed Use: 4%
- Open Space: 40%
- Public Facilities: 3%
- Rural Residential: 19%
- Urban Residential: 3%

* Breakdown within existing City limits
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Open Space Element
- Open space target increased from 3,000 acres to 4,000 acres
- Open space & ridgeline maps added
- Potential development rights retirement sites locations identified

Conservation Element
- Biological resource & surface water body maps added
- Discussions of all issues updated to reflect current physical & regulatory conditions
- Discussions of the following added:
  - Greenhouse gases (GHGs)
  - City’s green building program
Potential Development Rights
Retirement Sites
Significant Ridgelines

LEGEND
- Major Roads
- Calabasas City Boundary
- Plan Area Boundary
- Significant Ridgelines

Figure III-4
Significant Ridgelines in Calabasas

Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Housing Element

• Identification of sites to accommodate 521 units (per RHNA)
• Designation of multi-family sites @ 20 du/acre
• Proactive steps to preserve lower income at-risk rental housing
• Rental Registration Program maintained
• Locally-funded Rental Subsidy Program maintained
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Housing Element

- Permanent Mobilehome Park zoning proposed
- Second Unit ordinance proposed to be amended to allow by right
- Establishment of Workforce Housing Program to be evaluated
- Development Code revisions: 1) Define transitional and supportive housing as residential use; 2) Permit emergency shelters by-right in Commercial Limited (CL) zones (required by state law)
- Reasonable Accommodation procedures established
Circulation Element

- “Urban”/”rural” distinction eliminated and a single set of level of service (LOS) standards provided
  - Rural & urban roadways not defined in current plan
  - LOS B not attainable on certain “rural” roadways
- 2,400 daily trip “limit” on Lost Hills Road (north of freeway), Old Topanga Road, and Mulholland Highway eliminated
  - Not enforceable since City cannot control through traffic
  - City controls local traffic through land use element
- “Significance thresholds” in Policy A.3 (Policy VI-3 in draft element) modified
Circulation System

Arterial Streets connect Collector Streets with the principal arterial highway system. These streets link major commercial, residential, industrial, and institutional areas. Arterial streets are typically spaced about one mile apart to assure accessibility and reduce the incidence of traffic using collectors or local streets in lieu of a well-placed arterial street.

Collector Streets provide both access and circulation within residential and commercial areas. Collectors differ from arterials in that they provide more of a direct circulation function and not require as extensive control of access and penetrate residential neighborhoods. Collector streets are smaller in size and frequency than arterial streets.

Local Streets have the function of providing access to immediate adjacent land, such as residential areas. Service to "through traffic movement" on local streets is deliberately discouraged by design.


Legend:
- Calabasas City Boundary
- Plan Area Boundary
- Arterial
- Collector
- Local Street
- Level of Service Standard

*Figure VI-1
Calabasas Roadway System

City of Calabasas
## Recommended Circulation Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>Max Peak Hour V/C Increase*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Transportation Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71-0.80</td>
<td>0.010 (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81-0.90</td>
<td>0.006 (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010 (Urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.91-1.00</td>
<td>0.003 (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006 (Urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;1.00</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Currently a “limit” on V/C increase; change to “significance threshold” recommended.
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Safety Element
• Discussions of all issues updated to reflect current physical & regulatory conditions
• Table of “unacceptable” risks removed – thresholds not realistic
• Geologic hazard maps added
• Discussion of radon gas added

Noise Element
• Noise contour & measurement maps added
• Policy requiring new Noise Ordinance added with standards for:
  – Construction
  – Mixed use
• Interior/exterior noise standard table eliminated; to be replaced with Noise Ordinance
Seismic Hazard Zones

LEGEND

- Calabasas City Boundary
- Plan Area Boundary
- Zones of Required Investigation:
  - Liquefaction
    - Areas where historic occurrences of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions present a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as described in Public Resources Code Section 32682(b) would be required.
  - Earthquake-Induced Landslides
    - Areas where potential displacements of landslide movement, or local geotechnical, geotechnical, and subsurface water conditions that could present a potential for permanent ground displacements such that mitigation as described in Public Resources Code Section 32682(b) would be required.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY USED TO DEVELOP THIS MAP

- Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Calabasas Park 7.2 magnitude earthquake, Los Angeles County, California; Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (2014). For additional information on network hazards in this area, the reader is referred to the references, and additional references consulted, into website of the state of California (http://www.mine.ca.gov).

Copyright © 2014 by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. All rights reserved.

Figure 1.2
Seismic Hazard Zones

City of Calabasas
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Community Design Element

• New element
• References various design plans/standards adopted since 1995
  – Site Plan review
  – Old Town Calabasas, Las Virgenes Gateway, West Calabasas Road & Mulholland Highway master plans
  – Scenic corridor overlay zone
• Emphasis on compact urban form & open space protection
• Specific guidelines/policies for individual neighborhoods & mixed use districts
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Parks, Recreation & Trails Element
• Emphasis on continued & expanded joint use agreements with LVUSD
• Potential future park (sports field) sites identified
  – Pontopiddan
  – County site (northeast of 101/Lost Hills Road interchange)
  – Calabasas Landfill site

Cultural Resources Element
• Pre-historic & historic background discussions added
• Reference to new Historic Preservation Ordinance added
• Discussion of desire for improved cultural amenities included:
  – Cultural programs
  – Public art
  – Venues for theater, dance & children’s programs
Key Changes from 1995 General Plan (cont’d)

Services, Infrastructure & Technology Element

• Reorganized to include:
  – Fiscal management
  – Municipal & educational services
  – Water, sewer, storm drain & technological infrastructure

• Sewer system policy revised for areas currently on septic systems in order to:
  – Provide for regular monitoring & reporting of septic system performance
  – Provide for extension of sewer system where technically warranted, economically feasible & environmentally beneficial

• Discussion of technology added
  – Provide for citywide area network
  – Encourage provision of integrated technology and telecommunications facilities
  – Coordinate development of regional systems
Staff/Consultant Changes to GPAC Recommendations

Land Use Element

- **Policy II-4** – Requirement for adoption of a specific plan in conjunction with Craftsman’s Corner annexation removed
- **Policy II-7** – “semi-rural character” changed to “neighborhood character”
- **Policy II-8** – “overall semi-rural and residential character” changed to “overall residential character”
- **Policy II-9** – “assembly of distinct urban residential neighborhoods, rural communities, and rural residential areas” changed to “assembly of distinct neighborhoods”
Housing Element

- **Program 11: Inclusionary Housing** – GPAC recommended eliminating “in lieu housing fees as an option for meeting the City’s inclusionary housing requirement; staff recommend retaining lieu fees as an option.

- **Program 13: Workforce Housing** – GPAC recommended eliminating homeowner assistance program for the local workforce (teachers, police & firefighters, etc.) to be funded with the Housing Trust Fund; staff recommend retaining this program.
Additional Recommended Changes - Annexation

• Add the following at the end of the General Plan Approach:
  – Previously unforeseen annexation opportunities involving properties not indicated on Figure II-1 may arise from time to time and the City may consider such annexations as appropriate. Such consideration shall require an amendment to the General Plan

• Add the following note on figure II-1 (land use map):
  – Other lands adjacent to City boundaries may be considered for future annexation and will be considered as appropriate.
Additional Recommended Changes – Annexation (cont’d)

Recommended New Land Use Element Policy (Policy II-7)

For any annexation territory, all vested entitlements shall be recognized and retained by the City upon annexation, unless otherwise revised by mutual agreement of the City and the affected property owners, such that any revisions to vested entitlements will result in improved development patterns and conditions having less environmental impact. Because previously vested projects may not be fully consistent with the provisions of this General Plan, modifications to such projects may be found consistent with the General Plan if the following criteria are met:

– The overall density/intensity of the modified project is no greater than that of the vested project;
– The modified project will not result in any environmental impacts greater than those which would have resulted from the vested project; and
– The modified project achieves a substantially greater degree of consistency with the policies and objectives of the General Plan and complies more fully with the standards and requirements of the Development Code than the vested project.
HCD Comments on Draft Housing Element

Sites for Emergency Shelters

- Describe suitable CL zoned sites near services/facilities. Ensure processing procedures and standards facilitate, not constrain, provision of shelters.

Inclusionary Zoning

- Describe implementation requirements and economic incentives/regulatory concessions to ensure ordinance does not impact housing production.

Energy Conservation

- Describe how City will promote energy conservation in new and existing residential development.
HCD Comments on Draft Housing Element (cont’d)

Housing Programs

- **Extremely low income households** – ID programs to address.
- **Second Units** – Potential expansion to address extremely low income. ID how City to promote.
- **Density Bonus Program** – ID steps to promote program.
- **Renter Overpayment** - ID programs to address need.
- **Workforce Housing** - Potential expansion to rental housing.
- **Fair Housing Program** – ID methods to promote program.
HCD Comments on Draft Housing Element (cont’d)

Adequacy of Multi-Family Residential Sites

- **Rancho Pet Kennel Site** - Assess realistic development capacity based on status of existing uses, developable acreage.
- **Las Virgenes 2** – Assess realistic development capacity based on allowance of non-residential uses. Describe proposed development standards and any incentives for residential development.

Allowance for Residential Uses “By Right” on Sites Rezoned to Address RHNA Shortfall

- Las Virgenes 2 designated Planned Development under General Plan. To credit site toward RHNA, cannot require discretionary PD permit for residential component.
**Staff Recommendations to Address R-MF Site Issues**

**Issue:** Rancho Pet Kennel – Developable Acreage

**Recommendation:**
- Eliminate sloped portion of site from developable acreage. Reduces development potential to 5 acres of total 6.6-acre parcel with maximum yield of 100 units.

**Issue:** Discretionary Planned Development Permit

**Recommendation:**
- Re-designate multi-family portion of Las Virgenes 2 from PD to R-MF (20 du/acre). Balance of 16-acre site to remain PD.
### RHNA Shortfall

**Under Existing General Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Total RHNA</th>
<th>Entitled Projects/Bldg Permits</th>
<th>Unit Potential Under Current Zoning</th>
<th>RHNA Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low/Low</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>75 (Old Town Senior Housing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>139 @ 20+du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (Standard Pacific)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80 (Pet Kennel)</td>
<td>13 @ 12+du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Moderate</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>521</strong></td>
<td><strong>375</strong></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
<td><strong>152 total shortfall</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: 139 @ 20+du/acre; 13 @ 12+du/acre
**Option A:** Rancho Pet Kennel R-MF 20, portion *Las Virgenes 2 R-MF 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>Proposed Designation</th>
<th>Unit Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Pet Kennel</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>R-MF (20/ac)</td>
<td>100 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes 2</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>R-MF (20/ac) Planned Development</td>
<td>100 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result** – Sites for 200 lower income units, 60 moderate income units
**OPTION B: Rancho Pet Kennel RM 12, portion Las Virgenes 1 R-MF 20, portion Las Virgenes 2 R-MF 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
<th>Unit Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Pet Kennel</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>RM (12/ac)</td>
<td>60 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes 1 (northern site)</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>R-MF (20/ac)</td>
<td>40 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes 2</td>
<td>5 acres 11 acres</td>
<td>R-MF (20/ac) Planned Development</td>
<td>100 units 60 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULT – Sites for 140 lower income units, 120 moderate income units


**Re-designation Options to Address RHNA Shortfall (cont’d)**

**OPTION C: Rancho Pet Kennel RM 12, Golf Driving Range R-MF 20, portion *Las Virgenes 2 R-MF 20***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Developable Acreage</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
<th>Unit Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Pet Kennel</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>RM (12/ac)</td>
<td>60 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range</td>
<td>6 acres</td>
<td>RM-F (20/ac)</td>
<td>120 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes 2</td>
<td>5 acres 11 acres</td>
<td>R-MF (20/ac) Planned Development</td>
<td>100 units 60 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULT – Sites for 220 lower income units, 120 moderate income units**
Draft
Environmental Impact Report
CEQA Purposes

- Disclose the Significant Environmental Effects of Proposed Actions
- Identify Ways to Avoid or Reduce Environmental Damage
- Consider Feasible Alternatives to Proposed Actions
- Enhance Public Participation in the Planning Process

EIRs are informational documents, not policy documents.
CEQA Environmental Review Process

City circulates Notice of Preparation

City prepares Draft EIR

City files Notice of Completion

Public Review Period (45-day minimum)

City prepares Final EIR

City certifies EIR & makes decision on project

Responsible agencies comment on EIR scope

Public and responsible agencies comment on Draft EIR
Program EIR

• Prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project
• Allows for consideration of broad policy alternatives and programwide mitigation
• Can be used for subsequent activities that are consistent with the larger program if the activity would not create new significant environmental effects
• Not a “project EIR,” which considers individual development projects in more detail
Types of Impacts

- Unavoidably significant (Class I) – impacts that exceed significance thresholds and cannot be mitigated to below thresholds
- Significant, but mitigable (Class II) – impacts that exceed thresholds, but can be mitigated to below thresholds
- Less than significant (Class III) – impacts that do not exceed thresholds
- No impact/beneficial (Class IV)
Issues to be Analyzed per CEQA

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
Other Required CEQA Discussions

- Growth Inducement
- Significant Irreversible Effects
- Alternatives
  - No Project (both “no development” & 1995 General Plan)
  - 16 du/acre maximum for Residential-Multiple Family (R-MF) designation
  - Reduced development intensity in mixed use districts
  - No housing requirement in mixed use districts
  - Alternative sites for R-MF designation (Las Virgenes 1 & Golf Course Driving Range)
Major EIR Findings

• No “significant” impacts identified for most issue areas
  – General Plan land use map generally oriented toward environmental protection
  – Proposed General Plan policies & programs effectively address many potential impacts, making the plan largely self-mitigating

• Most identified “significant” impacts mitigated through additional policies or other plan revisions

Finding of “less than significant” impacts at policy level of analysis does not necessarily mean that individual developments will not have “significant” project-level impacts.
Potentially Significant Impacts

Air Quality

• Air Resources Board recommends siting of sensitive receptors at least 500 feet from freeway because of elevated diesel particulate concentrations

• Residences in mixed use districts & Rancho Pet Kennel site located within 500 feet of Ventura Freeway

• Potential impact addressed by new policy:

  
  Require applicants for projects containing sensitive receptors (such as residences, schools, day care centers, and medical facilities) on sites within 500 feet of the Ventura Freeway to demonstrate that health risks relating to diesel particulates would not exceed acceptable health risk standards prior to project approval.
Potentially Significant Impacts (cont’d)

Liquefaction/Landslides

• Land use plan facilitates development in liquefaction-prone areas (Westside Village, Las Virgenes 1 & 2) & landslide-prone areas (all hillsides)
• No specific policy statement addressing either issue
• Mitigation involves adding the following policy:

Prior to approval of development projects within the liquefaction or landslide hazard zones depicted on Figure VII-2 or other areas identified by the City Engineer as having significant liquefaction or landslide hazards, require applicants to prepare site-specific liquefaction and/or landslide studies and mitigation. Such studies shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.
Potentially Significant Impacts (cont’d)

Traffic and Circulation

• Potential exceedance of General Plan standards (LOS C/D) at the following intersections:
  – Lost Hills Road/Agoura Road (P.M. LOS E)
  – Las Virgenes Road/Agoura Road (P.M. LOS E)
  – Calabasas Road/Ventura Freeway SB ramps - West (A.M. LOS E, P.M. LOS F)
  – Parkway Calabasas/Ventura Boulevard (P.M. LOS E)
  – Calabasas Road/Valley Circle Boulevard (P.M. LOS E)

• Feasible mitigation available for all except Calabasas Road/Valley Circle Blvd. (City of Los Angeles)
Traffic Mitigation

- Lost Hills Rd/Agoura Rd & Las Virgenes Rd/Agoura Rd
  - Restriping/signal modifications; and
  - Reduce maximum FAR in Westside Village to 0.6 or limit maximum allowable development to 1.725 million sf (500K sf increase above existing)

- Calabasas Road/Ventura Freeway SB ramps
  - Additional east-west capacity needed
  - Widen WB approach to provide two through lanes and right-turn lane

- Parkway Calabasas/Ventura Boulevard
  - Widen and restripe northbound approach lane to provide shared left-turn-through lane and separate right-turn lane; and
  - Restripe southbound approach to provide shared left-through lane and shared through-right-turn lane; and
  - Reduce maximum FAR in Craftsman’s Corner to 0.95 or limit maximum allowable development to 2.2 million sf (~1.2 million sf increase above existing)
Other Key Issues

• Schools
  – Capacity issues at Lupin Hill Elementary potentially exacerbated by west side development
  – Not a significant impact under CEQA as state law mandates that collection of school impact fees reduces capacity impacts to less than significant, but a planning consideration

• Water Supply
  – Maximum buildout increases citywide water demand by 1.01 mgd
  – Maximum buildout demand exceeds LVMWD Master Plan forecast
  – Maximum buildout unlikely to occur and MWD forecasts show 20-25% reserve capacity through 2030
Alternatives

- No Project (no further development)
- No Project (1995 General Plan)
- 16 Units/Acre Maximum for R-MF Designation
- No Housing Requirement in Mixed Use Districts
- Alternative R-MF Sites
  - R-MF Designation for 2.5 Acres of Las Virgenes 1
  - R-MF Designation for Driving Range Site

None of the alternatives except No Project (no further development) would eliminate the unavoidably significant traffic impact.
Alternatives (cont’d)

• 1995 General Plan
  – Overall development potential similar to proposed General Plan
  – Slightly more potential for disturbance of “natural” resources; slightly less potential for compatibility conflicts within developed areas

• 16 DU/Acre Maximum for R-MF Designation
  – Slight reduction in traffic, aesthetic & other impacts
  – No change in significance determination
  – Housing Element would not comply with RHNA
### Residential Unit Potential for the Proposed General Plan and Alternative R-MF Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>RHNA Allocation</th>
<th>Unit Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low &amp; Low</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 110 units on 5.4 acres
- 1.23 dedicated open space acres
- Complies with all R-MF standards except impervious surface coverage (59% coverage exceeds 55% standard)
Las Virgenes 1 Site Alternative

- 40 MF units on 2 acres with 0.45 acres of dedicated open space (up to 30 SF units under proposed GP)
- Complies with all R-MF standards except impervious surface coverage (59%)
- Rancho Pet Kennel designated Res-Moderate (12 units/acre)
- Slight reduction in traffic on Lost Hills Rd; slight increase on Las Virgenes Rd
- Slight improvement with respect to compatibility (visual, noise)
Driving Range Site Alternative

- 120 units on 6 acres with 2.66 dedicated open space acres (site currently designated B-LI)
- Rancho Pet Kennel redesignated R-SF (up to 6 units/acre)
- Slight reduction in traffic on Lost Hills Rd & Calabasas Rd
- Compatibility conflicts generally similar to Rancho Pet Kennel site
- Increased landslide hazard (designated landslide hazard area)
- Increased biological (oak) impacts
- Reduced impact to west side elementary school
Comments on the Draft EIR

- 8 comment letters received as of August 29
  - County Sanitation Districts
  - Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains
  - LVUSD
  - LVMWD
  - Hidden Hills
  - L.A. County Public Health
  - Mary Hubbard, Malibu Canyon Community Association
  - Irv and Reva Isaacman, local residents
Key Issues Raised

- Final disposition of Calabasas Landfill (Sanitation Districts/County Health Dept)
- Biological & water quality impacts due to buildout of Las Virgenes 1 & 2 sites (Resource Conservation District)
- Possible annexation of Craftsman’s Corner (Hidden Hills)
- Alternative multi-family residential sites (Hubbard)

Most comments do not pertain to the adequacy of the EIR and none identify new significant environmental impacts.
DEIR Text Modifications

• Clarifications based on comments received:
  – Solid waste/landfill data
  – Description of LVUSD facilities
  – Description of annexation approval process for Craftsman’s Corner
  – Water quality status of Las Virgenes Creek/Malibu Creek
  – Las Virgenes Road scenic corridor status (alternatives analysis)

• Other editorial changes:
  – Corrections to table nos./references
  – Minor typographical corrections
Additional Suggested Changes to Geology Section

- Concerns raised with respect to landslide discussion in Section 4.5, Geology
- Suggested changes include:
  - Minor clarifications to discussions of ground acceleration, lateral spreading, and expansive soils
  - Clarification of the severity of landslide hazards throughout hillside areas
  - References to maps & studies other than state landslide hazard map
  - Expanded list of regional faults
  - Description of the City’s process for geotechnical review of individual projects

Suggested changes clarify geologic conditions, but do not identify new significant impacts.
Staff Recommendation

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-434 recommending to the City Council:

- Certification of an Environmental Impact Report as being adequate and conformant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA Guidelines
- Approval of File No. 080000815, amending the General Plan for the City of Calabasas by adopting the 2030 General Plan update.