

December 21, 2003

Re: Response to Canyon Hills Project (EAF NO. ENV-2002-2481-EIR) EIR NOP

Ms. Zaitzevsky:

RECEIVED  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEC 26 2003  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
UNIT

We are writing to express our concerns re:

*Density:* The designation "open space" is a misnomer. At this time, there is no land being dedicated or deeded as permanent open space (OS); therefore we can assume that a proposal for development in the OS area will be in the offing shortly. Because of the density proposed for parts A and B, precedent will be set with this designation and not only the remaining 600 acres will easily acquire this intensive zoning, but all surrounding acreage as well. It is our opinion the resulting impact will be significant on infrastructure such as police, fire, and recreational services. With this in mind, we believe the developer should now be required to set aside land to accommodate the future demand for services.

64-1

*Fire Response Time:* Because the issue of fire is of critical concern in the mountain/hillside districts and the fire department considers the existing facilities inadequate to attend Canyon Hills, both the density and the number of units should be revisited.

64-2

*Recreation:* Recreational opportunities will be inadequate for residents of the 280 homes. When recreational opportunities are lacking, youngsters gravitate to unsavory activity (even youngsters from affluent homes). And it is in fact difficult to reach or participate in recreational activity on hillside acreage. We therefore suggest that the developer be required to provide parkland for this hillside community.

64-3

*Traffic:* We do not dispute the existing traffic figures compiled by the department. We do however have some concerns regarding future traffic projections and the impact on the existing canyon neighborhood. Apparently calculation formulas for projected traffic in hillside areas has not changed in the last 30 years or so, as 9-10 trips per day was the figure suggested in those years. We are concerned, however, that the numbers do not adequately reflect present service vehicle trips per day. For example, trash pickup in the city of Los Angeles is now accomplished by 3-4 trucks instead of the original single truck; and the omnipresent "2-3 cable repair trucks" visit our Shadow Hills neighborhood on a daily basis as do the services of gardening and housekeeping that are required for maintenance of the homes of two income families. By themselves, these numbers do not represent a significant impact, but multiplied in relation to 280, we believe the cumulative figure will affect both the traffic and level of noise in this semi-rural/rural canyon area significantly.

64-4

*Open Space:* The issue of open space designation proposed for the Canyon Hills Development leaves many questions unanswered. For example, what is the future for this area described as open space (OS)? Who will own it? Who will maintain the fire buffers required by the fire department? Are there existing plans for future development or will the open space be someday converted to public parkland? Can this acreage be closed to the public due to issues of liability or for any other reason? Will the Canyon Hills Homeowners association want this acreage as a liability in perpetuity?

64-5

Andrea and James Gutman  
10511 Mahoney Drive  
Sunland, Ca. 91040