

WILLIAM E. EICK
ATTORNEY AT LAW
2604 FOOTHILL BOULEVARD, SUITE C
LA CRESCENTA, CALIFORNIA 91214

TELEPHONE: (818) 248-0050

FACSIMILE: (818) 248-2473

December 30, 2003

Maya Zaitzevsky, Project Coordinator
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 763
Los Angeles, California 90012

VIA FACSIMILE
213-978-1343

Re: Canyon Hills Project
ENV-2002-2481-EIR
SCH No. 2002091018
October 2003

Dear Ms. Zaitzevsky:

As the land use chairman of the Shadow Hills Property Owners Association, I have the following comments to the above referenced DEIR:

1. The California Department of Transportation has extensive drainage easements throughout the project area. These easements were created as part of the construction of the 210 Freeway and were paid for by the State of California as part of the condemnation process. The DEIR does not adequately address the existence of those drainage easements. The following questions need to be addressed:

169-1

1.1 A map of the drainage easement should be attached to the EIR, which map should include the acreage affected by that easement.

1.2 What is the exact language which created the drainage easement?

169-2

1.3 How does the existence of the drainage easement affect each project alternative?

169-3

1.4 What development can take place on the land subject to the drainage easement without the approval of the California Department of Transportation?

169-4

Maya Zaitzevsky, Project Coordinator

Re: ENV-2002-2481-EIR

12/30/03

Page 2

1.5 Does the existing drainage easement protect the structural integrity of the 210 Freeway?

169-5

1.6 What development can take place on the drainage easements without affecting the structural integrity of the 210 Freeway?

1.7 If the drainage easement cannot be used to build houses or infrastructure then how many houses can be built under current zoning, and the slope density and Hillside ordinances on the project site if the land subject to the drainage easement is excluded from the project?

169-6

2. The project fails to adequately address the traffic issues in the following particulars:

2.1 What is the traffic impact on La Tuna Canyon Boulevard since the major shopping complex in the area (Empire Center in Burbank), the major movie theatre in the area (AMC in Burbank) and the major private school in the area (Village Christian) are most closely accessed through La Tuna Canyon?

169-7

2.2 If because of additional traffic as described in Section 2.1 the City required the developer to widen La Tuna Canyon Boulevard to two lanes in both directions (rather than sometimes one lane and sometimes two lanes), what would be the environmental effect of such a widening?

169-8

3. The DEIR fails to adequately address issues related to two points of ingress and egress. The DEIR needs to answer the following questions:

169-9

3.1 What are the environmental effects if two non-emergency points of ingress and egress to the project are required by the city?

3.2 What are the environmental effects on ingress and egress if the city does not permit roads within the project to transgress the prominent ridgeline and two points of ingress and egress are required for each side of a prominent ridgeline?

169-10

4. The DEIR fails to analyze reasonable alternates.

4.1 What would the environmental effects be if the developers' analysis of the currently permitted number of structures (less than 90) were "clustered" into 20,000 square foot lots rather than spread out over the entire project area?

169-11

Maya Zaitzevsky, Project Coordinator
Re: ENV-2002-2481-EIR
12/30/03
Page 3

4.2 What would the environmental impact be of an alternative project which only allowed the number of houses permitted if the drainage easement area were not included as buildable?

169-12

Very truly yours,



William E. Eick,
Land Use Chairman of the
Shadow Hills Property Owners Association

WEE/at

cc. Council Member Wendy Greuel