



Los Angeles City Planning Department

6262 Van Nuys Boulevard • Suite 351 • Van Nuys, CA 91401



FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT **Volume II**

CANOGA PARK–WINNETKA–WOODLAND HILLS–WEST HILLS COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

The Village at Westfield Topanga

ENV-2007-3393-EIR

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2007101117

Council District 3

THIS DOCUMENT COMPRISES THE SECOND AND FINAL PART OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE PROJECT DESCRIBED. THE DRAFT EIR (VOLUMES I THROUGH IX), WHICH WAS PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT, COMPRISES THE FIRST PART.

Project Address: 6360 North Topanga Canyon Boulevard; 21700–21870 West Victory Boulevard; 6351 North Owensmouth Avenue; 21919–21945 Erwin Street, Woodland Hills, California 91367

Project Description: Westfield, LLC, the project Applicant, proposes to develop The Village at Westfield Topanga. The project would include the phased development of approximately 444,744 square feet of shopping center uses including an approximately 165,759-square-foot anchor retailer, which would support an ancillary member-only fueling station, tire installation center, and internet auto sales use, and approximately 278,985 square feet of shopping center retail space. In addition, the project would include a 275-room hotel with ground floor dining and retail uses, which would consist of approximately 193,600 square feet. Also proposed as part of the project are approximately 53,635 square feet of restaurant uses, an approximately 36,765-square-foot grocery store, approximately 285,000 square feet of office uses, and approximately 14,250 square feet of community/cultural center uses. The project includes an option to convert a portion (approximately 53,900 square feet) of the approximately 278,985 square feet of shopping center retail space to an approximately 2,200-seat movie theater. The proposed project would also include surface parking and multi-level parking facilities providing approximately 3,362 parking spaces upon full buildout of the project. Approximately 6.19 acres of landscape/hardscape open space would also be provided within the project site.

The Applicant is requesting the following approvals from the City of Los Angeles: Vesting Tentative Tract Map; Warner Center Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance, including shared parking, project phasing, floor area and lot coverage averaging, a height increase, and a Uniform Sign Program; Alcohol Conditional Use Permit; Development Agreement; Conditional Use Permit for automotive uses; Haul Route Approval; compliance with the Green Building Ordinance; and concurrent consideration and processing of all entitlement requests. Additional approvals from local and state agencies will also be necessary.

APPLICANT:
Westfield, LLC

PREPARED BY:
Matrix Environmental

PREPARED FOR:
Los Angeles City Planning Department

July 2011

III. Responses to Comments

(Continued)



Comment Letter No. 25

Dennis T. DiBiase, AIA LEED AP
20525 Aetna St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
denkardib@msn.com

Comment No. 25-1

I have reviewed The Village at Westfield Topanga Draft Environmental Impact Report (ENV-2007-3393-EIR).

As an architect with over thirty years experience, and as a Partner in a 40 person architectural firm in Santa Monica concentrating on large urban infill and mixed use projects, I have carefully compiled my comments to this DEIR and I offer my professional judgement [sic] as to where there are shortcomings in the document and where the project itself needs improvement and much more scrutiny.

Also as a resident of Woodland Hills since 1988, I have been offering my professional expertise to the community through my active role serving in the following local and government affiliations-

1. **Area 1 Residential Representative for the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council**
2. **Co-chair of the Planning, Land Use and Mobility Committee for the 18**
3. **District 3 Appointee to the Ventura- Cahuenga Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan Review Board**
4. **Member of the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Warner Center Specific Plan and its Land Use Sub-committee**
5. **Director-at-large for the Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization**

Participating in these roles has allowed me access to a great deal of information and attendance at many of Westfield's presentations. Also, my involvement has afforded contact with and opportunities to exchange thoughtful opinions with stakeholders, the applicant, the local press, employees and elected representatives of the City of Los Angeles and my colleagues in these organizations.

Response to Comment No. 25-1

This comment acknowledges review of the Draft EIR by the Commentor and provides a description of the Commentor's professional background. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-2

My evaluation of the current status of opinion in the community is this- the business community welcomes the project, regardless of the details, with open arms. The members of the organizations listed above, welcome the project, but in no way see it as a quality proposal as currently presented. The politicians and the business community want to push this project through. Publically, the politicians say we will have input, but in practice, we haven't seen it at all.

Response to Comment No. 25-2

The general public has several opportunities to comment and provide input on the project. In response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, the project was reduced in size by approximately 774,000 square feet. In July 2010, a Notice of Community Workshop was mailed to the public with information about the reduced project, including the anchor retailer and a public meeting was held to present an overview of the refined project. The comment period on the Draft EIR was also extended from 45 days to 60 days to allow the public additional time to comment. The public will also have continued opportunities to provide input at each of the public hearings that will be held by the City of Los Angeles on the project. Modified site plans proposed by the community were also analyzed as Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for more information. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-3

This DEIR reflects a white washing of the issues to achieve approval. The document has been written with a starting premise of support for the project as it is currently designed. The fees to cover the expenses of the DEIR have been provided by Westfield. This reinforces this 'predetermining of the conclusion' type of process that is apparent.

Upon careful scrutiny, this DEIR has many, many general statements without backup support, and most of the alternates presented seem to be chosen to point back to the Proposed Project as being the obvious solution.

Response to Comment No. 25-3

The City of Los Angeles serves as the Lead Agency for the Project and Westfield, LLC, is the Project Applicant. Per the requirements contained in Section § 21082.1 of the CEQA Statute and Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles in its capacity as the Lead Agency is required to independently review and analyze the Draft EIR, circulate a Draft EIR that reflects its independent judgment, and as part of the certification of the Draft EIR, find that the Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section § 15126.6, the intent of the Draft EIR alternatives analysis is to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA, a range of reasonable alternatives was considered in the Draft EIR analysis. These alternatives included six alternatives that addressed the feasibility of eliminating or reducing the significant impacts of the project and the ability to meet the basic objectives of the project.

Comment No. 25-4

Throughout the process, the applicant, Westfield, has never shown an ability to vary from the Anchor Retailer's demands to throw down a generic plan on the site. As PLUM Co-chair, our meetings with them showed a very uncooperative applicant team.

Response to Comment No. 25-4

As discussed in Response to Comment No. 25-2, the community has had several opportunities to provide input on the project and will continue to have several opportunities to provide input as the project moves through the entitlement process. In response to community input, several refinements to design of the project were made that include improvements to the project's circulation, access, and visual corridors. Refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a more detailed discussion regarding refinements to the site plan. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-5

The east half of the site goes against every vision the leaders and planners in the community have had for Warner Center. Mayor Bradley's stated at the opening of the Voit

Towers over twenty years ago, that Warner Center would be the Century City of the west valley. Today, the vision also encompasses modern urban planning thought.

Response to Comment No. 25-5

The project would be consistent with the vision for the current Warner Center area set forth by adopted plans. Specifically, as discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project conforms to the Specific Plan, and the project would be consistent with the land use designations and the intent of the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan and the General Plan Framework Element.

Comment No. 25-6

This DEIR contains the words that modern urban planners use; pedestrian orientation, activation, connectivity, etc. but the words are just words. The physical project has quite a ways to go to meet such admirable ideas.

Response to Comment No. 25-6

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5 and in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been specifically designed as a walkable outdoor mixed-use project. Refer to Figures II-6, II-28, and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and to the internal pedestrian access graphic provided in Topical Response No. 5.

Comment No. 25-7

In deference to the applicant, recent proposals for coming back to the table, and their proposals to make a better Big Box and to at least screen the fueling station, show a renewed spirit of cooperation with the community. As my comments will show, there is a lot to do still though. These solutions and the rest of the project need detailed scrutiny.

Response to Comment No. 25-7

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-8

And finally, the tax revenue and jobs claimed by the applicant to be gained, attracting the unbridled interest of the city, have a lot more chance of coming to fruition with a quality

project that is supported by the community instead of a flawed project that would only achieve partial support.

Response to Comment No. 25-8

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-9

I therefore respectfully request that the city do their job, represent their constituents, review these and all the comments presented and really consider the suggestions. Its [sic] time that the city role up their sleeves and get to work along with us, and make this project acceptable to all. This is, after all, the type of project that affects not just us, but the next generations to come.

Response to Comment No. 25-9

All of the comments received have been carefully reviewed by the City and responded to as part of this Final EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-10

Introduction

The following comments are my personal responses to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for The Village at Westfield Topanga. The DEIR encompasses an overwhelming amount of information, a quantity that no one person on their personal time could ever hope to thoroughly review and respond to. Although a major portion of the document has been reviewed, comments are being held to the more general chapters, and repetition of the comments is held to a minimum. The referenced page numbers and items in the DEIR usually represent the first time the comment would be relevant.

There are two parts to my response list. One contains the comments relative to the DEIR in its entirety. The second part concentrates on detailed responses to the statements made regarding "Alternate 'F'- Modified site Plans Alternate". [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-10

The Village at Westfield Topanga Draft EIR consists of nine volumes, two of which comprise the Draft EIR and the remaining seven of which include appendices. In addition, the Draft EIR also includes a Summary section that summarizes the impacts of the project by environmental topic and includes mitigation measures proposed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document. This comment regarding review of the Draft EIR by the Commentor is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-11**PUBLIC COMMENTS- PART I****Volume I****I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. **Page 6, Item 4 Overview** *“If such contingencies are not met, this tenant will not be able to go forward, and the Applicant will complete the entitlement process while it seeks to identify other potential anchors.”*

Comment- In the event that an alternate anchor tenant needs to be proposed, will a Supplemental EIR be required? Many justifications for the Anchor’s proposed uses are based on the ‘Member Only’ premise. For instance without the Member Only premise, would the screening of the fueling station have to be rethought? If this characteristic goes away, wouldn’t environmental reevaluation be warranted?

Response to Comment No. 25-11

As discussed in Section I, Executive Summary, page 7, of the Draft EIR, the project proposes to include an anchor retailer which may be a Costco or another anchor tenant. The analysis is focused on the proposed Costco use because it is the use that is reasonably anticipated to occur at the project site. When compared with other anchor retail uses, the member only aspects of the Costco use such as the fuel and tire station could result in reduced new trips, and greater shared use trips, which might not be the case with alternate uses. However, it is anticipated that other anchor tenants would, overall, yield equivalent trip impacts to that analyzed in the Draft EIR. To the extent that in the future, a

specific anchor tenant were determined by the City to generate trips that exceed the number of trips analyzed in the Draft EIR, further environmental review may be warranted. In addition, in the event that a non-member-only fueling station is developed at the project site, the project would incorporate similar screening of the fueling station as is currently proposed.

Comment No. 25-12

2. Page 6, Item 4.A- *“The proposed improvements are intended tounify the shopping center uses in the surrounding project area”* [sic]

Comment- More information needs to be provided of how the three shopping centers separated by large expanses of surface parking and highly traveled boulevards are being unified. Simply locating more retail between the two existing malls and connecting them with landscaped pedestrian paths does not unify the uses because of the distances. Providing a shuttle system may help. Also, the addition of more retail seems to cause competitiveness instead of unity. Proposing a project with a larger ratio of complementary uses such as residential and office in addition to some retail would seem to create a mixed use atmosphere and in turn more unity. Although some is proposed on this project, an over emphasis on the retail use could use some reevaluation.

Response to Comment No. 25-12

As discussed and illustrated in Topical Response No. 5, and illustrated in Figures II-28 and II-29 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed as a cohesive, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of compatible uses and pedestrian amenities that would promote pedestrian access throughout and around the project site. The project would also provide landscaped pedestrian paths and publicly accessible landscaped open space areas that will serve to unify the project site. In addition, full buildout of the project’s streetscape elements, including construction of the multiuse trails, sidewalks, and pedestrian amenities such as new benches and shelters will be provided as part of Phase 1. Also part of Phase 1, an active pedestrian courtyard is proposed adjacent to the anchor retailer which will serve to integrate the anchor retailer with the project’s other uses by connecting directly with the Topanga Canyon Boulevard retail and open space areas while maintaining easy access to the central parking facility. As shown in the refined site plans provided in Topical Response No. 5, the parking structure at the project site will be activated by wrapping it with retail uses. In addition, the “paseo system” will provide for protected pedestrian movement throughout the project site and will connect with safe and controlled passageways to the surrounding properties. Furthermore, from the Westfield Topanga Shopping Center to the north of the project site, a dedicated, tree-lined walking path would provide pedestrians with direct access to the project site. In addition, pedestrians at the Westfield Promenade to the south of the project

site can enter the project site from either of the two Erwin Street entries, providing direct access to the project's hotel and the southern end of the project's retail. The project site will also include three "gateway" corners, or shaded mini-plaza areas for pedestrians to stop and rest. These gateway corners will be located at the corner of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue, Victory Boulevard and Topanga Canyon Boulevard, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Erwin Street. These mini plaza areas will consist of special paving, seating, lighting, canopies, and landscaped walls which will form a gateway into the Warner center area, as set forth in the Specific Plan.

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's pedestrian connections to adjacent uses, including the Westfield Topanga and Westfield Promenade shopping center. The merchandising mix for the project is being carefully considered so that it will provide retail uses which are complementary to the adjacent Westfield Topanga and Westfield Promenade shopping centers.

Comment No. 25-13

3. Page 8, Item 4.A.a.- *"Deliveries for the retail component would generally occur during the daytime hours."*

Comment- More detail regarding deliveries and potential traffic conflicts need to be reviewed. The scheduling of deliveries would be better between 6am and 10am, before the retail spaces open for business. Truck routes need to be presented. Truck routes should avoid Erwin and Owensmouth as Residential uses occur along those streets.

4. Page 8, item 4.A.a.- *"In addition, approximately 7 to 12 large delivery trucks would arrive between 1:00am and 10am with one delivery around 9:00pm."*

Comment- This seems like a delivery method more appropriate for an industrial zone. Erwin and Owensmouth should be avoided because of residential uses on these streets.

Response to Comment No. 25-13

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-33.

Comment No. 25-14

5. Page 10, Item 4.A.b.- *"...community/cultural center...this space is anticipated to be flexible meeting rooms and spaces to be used for various community functions. These uses are anticipated to be located on the interior of the site."*

Comment- More work with the community needs to take place to better define what the uses will be and what accommodations will be required. Examples of Community and Recreation Centers that are located in Thousand Oaks, Calabasas, and Porter Ranch should be looked at during the detailed programming of this use. Meeting rooms, larger multipurpose rooms for more active uses, child care, and connections to outdoor space should be considered. The Community Center would be better if located in Phase I, on the ground floor and at the exterior of the site. Visibility is important to promote the centers [sic] use and to promote a sense of shared ownership by the applicant and the community. Integrating the community center with the retail paseo and/or public streets is very important. This is a function that would do well facing Topanga, Owensmouth or Victory Boulevard. The proposed plan would obviously accommodate this function facing Topanga but would not allow the other options currently.

Response to Comment No. 25-14

While the location of the community center has not yet been determined, a community center space will be provided as part of the project and will be programmed and utilized consistent with a family-friendly environment. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 for more information regarding a community center in Phase 1.

Comment No. 25-15

6. **Page 11, Item 4.B.-** *“Vehicular access to and from parking will be provided via driveways and ramps”* [sic]

Comment- Provide more information as to how the large centralized parking garage will work. Is there more than one ramp per level for all those cars? Without human traffic controls, as occurs during the holidays at the Topanga Mall, will the garage be confusing?

Response to Comment No. 25-15

Preliminary design of the parking structure indicates that there are three ramps from the ground floor to Floor 2 and one four-lane speed ramp will be available to access Floors 3 through 6. The internal speed ramp system has the capacity to serve 3,200 parking spaces. In this case, only a total of 2,400 spaces are located on Floors 2 through 6.

If necessary during the holiday period, the Applicant may elect to implement on-site traffic controls similar to existing holiday operations at their other developments.

Comment No. 25-16

7. **Page 11, Item 4.B.-** *“...the existing signal on Victory Boulevard, between Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue....will be relocated to the west...”*

Comment- This move brings the signal closer to the busy intersection of Victory Boulevard and Topanga Canyon Boulevards and its associated queues. Provide information to justify this is not an issue.

Response to Comment No. 25-16

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-35.

Comment No. 25-17

8. **Page 12, Item 4.C.-** *“Within the central portion of the project site where a parking structure is proposed, a height zone of 90 feet would be established.”*

Comment- The height of parking structures should be minimized as much as possible. Provide justification for the height proposed as the structure is presented as a one level on grade plus five level parking facility. Except where necessary to align with the two adjacent retail floors, the floor to floor [sic] heights should be minimized to reduce the overall affect of the parking structure on aesthetic and other issues covered by the DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 25-17

The Applicant has proposed the heights for the parking levels at 18 feet, especially between the ground level and the first level of parking for a variety reasons. First, it allows second-floor access between the parking structure and the connected retail. It also allows the environment to feel more open, receive better light, and create a safer, more visible environment for patrons. In addition, as described in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, page 253, of the Draft EIR, proposed parking on-site would be designed to maximize efficiency and minimize visual impacts, such as that currently presented by the large expanses of surface parking on-site that exists. Specifically, much of the parking to be provided on-site would be located within the parking structure in the central portion of the project site, and thus would be largely screened from view along surrounding streets by proposed buildings and landscaping. Surface parking would primarily be located along Topanga Canyon Boulevard and would be screened from the adjacent street with street trees and other landscaping. Furthermore, since maximum heights of 247.5 feet are permitted at the project site, the parking structure's maximum height of 90 feet would fall well below the maximum permitted heights under the Los

Angeles Municipal Code and Warner Center Specific Plan. Lastly, the height zones established for the project site, including the 90 foot height zone within the central portion of the project site where the parking structure is proposed, would be consistent in scale with the predominantly low-rise and mid-rise commercial buildings across Topanga Canyon Boulevard and the retail buildings of the Westfield Topanga shopping center across Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 25-18

9. Page 12, Item 4.C.- *“.....height zones are proposed which would allow flexibility in terms of the location of the project’s individual buildings”*

Comment- Flexibility should be allowed for environmental assessment, but much less flexibility should be allowed for the final project application approval. Provide an explanation as to the final commitments for Phase I and for Phase II and the limits to the flexibility being referred to here.

Response to Comment No. 25-18

The conceptual building plans included in the Draft EIR are sufficient for the purposes of evaluating the project’s environmental impacts under CEQA. CEQA does not require that an EIR include the analysis of final building plans. All project design features identified in the Draft EIR will be implemented within the final design of the project. Furthermore, the project is required to comply with the Specific Plan, which includes a number of design elements.

Comment No. 25-19

10. Page12, Item 4.D.- *“The proposed anchor retailer food court.....”*

Comment- Clarify if this food court will be member only.

Response to Comment No. 25-19

Purchase of food in the food court will be open to the public, and not restricted to members.

Comment No. 25-20

11. Page 13, Item 4.D.- *“The entry courtyard would be centered at the end of the retail open space area and adjacent to the central parking garage.”*

Comment- The statement is not correct. The entry courtyard is not centered on the retail open space. The parking garage needs to be shortened in length to allow the centering to occur. Views of the Entry Court are possible but the parking structure actually will dominate the vista from the retail open space. Provide a correction to this statement or more detailed design information to show how the statement can remain as shown.

Response to Comment No. 25-20

The open space between the anchor retail building and the adjacent retail areas was reorganized to improve the usability and accessibility of this area. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding this modified site plan.

Comment No. 25-21

12. Page 13, Item 4.D.- “...that would mark the corner as a gateway element.”

Comment- The labeling of this element as a gateway seems incorrect. In fact the three corners of the site that show gateway elements do not allow entry into the site at these locations. These elements are better described as signage/landscape sculpture. What starts to become clear is a lack of pedestrian connection into the site at the corners. Real gateway elements are more appropriate where the vehicles or pedestrians enter the site. Gateways are defined as follows-

gate-way n.1. An opening or a structure framing an opening, such as an arch, that may be closed by a gate. 2. Something that serves as an entrance or a means of access: a gateway to success; the gateway to the West. 3. Software or hardware that enables communication between computer networks that use different communications protocols. Also called router². [sic] [Footnote not included.]

Response to Comment No. 25-21

As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the new landscaping along each of the street edges would feature native planting, bioswales, and mature trees, canopies for shade, trash receptacles, mini-plaza areas at each street corner to create a landscaped gateway feature, and amenities such as pedestrian scaled lighting and seating. The landscaped plaza areas at the street front corners of the project site (e.g., Owensmouth Avenue at Victory Boulevard; Victory Boulevard at Topanga Canyon Boulevard; and Topanga Canyon Boulevard at Erwin Street), would feature amenities such as seating, lighting, canopies and special paving that would mark the corner as a “gateway” element. In addition, the street front corners would be further accented with groups of trees. Furthermore, as shown in Figure II-28, of the Draft EIR, consistent with the Specific

Plan goals of encouraging pedestrian activity along the corridors, the paths crossing the landscaped plaza areas would connect to the rest of the project's uses internal to the site, and connect to uses in the surrounding area. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the gateway elements and pedestrian connections through the project site.

Comment No. 25-22

13. Page 13, Item 4.D- *"....these paths connect project's uses internal to the site" [sic]*

Comment- This statement and Figure II-28 entitled 'Conceptual Walkability Plan' imply that ample pedestrian connections are afforded from Owensmouth Avenue to the main pedestrian spaces internal to the site. Paths are shown to be transversing surface parking lots and the first floor of the parking structure. Provide more design information regarding the paths. A more direct path, less uncontrolled intermixing of vehicle and pedestrian, brightly lit parking structure paths, landscape separations on the paths through the parking areas and a general reinforcement of the concepts presented need to take place before the statement quoted here could be thought of as accurate.

Response to Comment No. 25-22

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the pedestrian connectivity from Owensmouth Avenue into the project site.

Comment No. 25-23

14. Page 14, Item 4.D- *"the project would provide a minimum 15 foot wide landscape setback.....along the project's Victory and Owensmouth frontages."*

Comment- The Warner Center Specific Plan requires a setback of 25' along these frontages. A request for exception to this is not included in the list of requests listed in Part II, "Project Description", [sic] of this DEIR. The controversy associated with these frontages that has occurred would warrant this request being made clearer. Also, it would seem that consideration of a denial of this request seems warranted considering the concerns about the 450' long wall and the screening required for the Member Only Fuel Station. Also, Owensmouth is actually required to have a 40 foot [sic] setback unless the uses are deemed Pedestrian Serving. If pedestrian serving, the setback can be reduced to 25 feet. The Fueling Station does not meet the definition of pedestrian serving uses that appears in Section 4 of the WCSP and in the Appendix E.2 entitled 'Owensmouth Parkway'. The area around the transit stop is allowed to have a reduced setback to 25 feet per the plan.

Response to Comment No. 25-23

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan provides setback relief for properties between Erwin Street and Oxnard Street, providing dedications for the establishment of the Warner Center Transit Hub. The project is not within this area and is not requesting a reduced setback for a transit stop.

Comment No. 25-24

15. Page 14, Item 4.D.- *"The new pedestrian and multi-use trails would lead directly from bus stops at the perimeter of the site to the interior of the project site."*

Comment- The Owensmouth bus stop does not have a direct connection to the interior of the project site. The pedestrian connections shown are not direct, improperly located and insufficiently defined. See Page 13, item 4.D. comment.

Response to Comment No. 25-24

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project site's pedestrian connectivity from public transit.

Comment No. 25-25

16. Page 14, Item 4.D.- *".....and pathways through the site (with lighting, landscaping, and seating."*

Comment- Provide a design for the internal walkway through the parking areas including the lighting, landscaping, and seating mentioned. These elements don't seem to be included in the drawings.

Response to Comment No. 25-25

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the internal walkway through the project's parking areas.

Comment No. 25-26

17. Page 14, Item 4.E.- *"....the anchor retailer building along Victory will use a variety of materials such as....."*

Comment- The elevation of this building included in the project description of this DEIR shows the use of glass panels and tiled mural elements as well. This should be added to the materials list.

Response to Comment No. 25-26

In response to this comment, the anchor retailer building materials list described throughout the Draft EIR has been revised to include the use of glass panels and tiled mural elements. Please also refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 25-27

18. Page 15, Item 4.E- *“dual towers would punctuate the comers of the building and which would minimize the horizontality of the building mass.....”*

Comment- The towers at the corners would punctuate the corners only. An additional tower closer to the middle (but not exactly in the middle) would minimize the horizontality.

Response to Comment No. 25-27

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the anchor retail building’s design elements, articulation, and vertical breaks which are intended to minimize the horizontality.

Comment No. 25-28

19. Page 17, item 4.H- *“Trucks would exit.....south on Owensmouth Avenue, west on Erwin Street.....”*

Comment- The haul route is directed down the streets where multifamily uses occur. Revise the route if possible to avoid these areas.

Response to Comment No. 25-28

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-33.

Comment No. 25-29

20. Page 19, Item I- *“The approvals required by the City of Los Angeles.....Such hearings are anticipated to include.....”*

Comment- Add “a Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council hearing” [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-29

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-41 for a discussion of the City of Los Angeles hearings required for approval of the project.

Comment No. 25-30

21. Page 21, Item 5.- *“A two story 41,480 square foot office building is located at 6351 Owensmouth Avenue.”*

Comment- A representative of the applicant stated at a presentation to the Citizen’s Advisory Committee for the Warner Center Specific Plan on October 18, 2010 that this building would be renovated. It was confirmed by the applicant’s representative in that meeting, as part of this Project, this building’s exterior would be re-clad to better fit with the overall project’s aesthetic.

Response to Comment No. 25-30

Re-cladding of the existing building at 6351 Owensmouth Avenue is not part of the proposed project.

Comment No. 25-31

22. Page 30, Item 9.A.a.(1)(a)- *“The project would incorporate a landscape plan that would provide landscaped pedestrian walkways.....and newly greened street frontages”* [sic]

Comments- To better guarantee consistency in paving materials and plantings provide all street frontage improvements including all work that borders Phase I and Phase II all at the same time as part of a Pre-phase I project including the Gateway elements, except at very few selected points designated for future construction access.

Response to Comment No. 25-31

Phase 1 will include full buildout of the project’s streetscape elements, including construction of the multiuse trails, meandering sidewalks, and pedestrian amenities such as new benches and shelters.

Comment No. 25-32

23. Page 31, Item 9.A.a.(1)(b)2.- *“....The development of a cohesive, pedestrian oriented site...”*

Comment- The non-active uses along Westfield Way does not support this premise. The parking garage and the ‘backs’ of the retail buildings facing this street create a pedestrian dead zone. Also the location of the fueling station and the large surface parking lot along Owensmouth Avenue with no active uses, separates Owensmouth from the pedestrian open spaces of the project.

Response to Comment No. 25-32

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5 and in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been specifically designed as a walkable outdoor mixed-use project. Refer to Figures II-6, II-28, and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and to the internal pedestrian access graphic provided in Topical Response No. 5. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, the central parking structure and adjacent retail uses have been designed such that they are linked together so that the retail engages the lower two levels of the parking directly, which will ease the movement of pedestrians to the retail areas.

Comment No. 25-33

24. Page 31, Item 9.A.a.(1)(b)2.- *“The project would be substantially consistent with the visual resources and urban design policies of the General Plan Framework, and the Canoga Park- Winnetka-Woodland Hills- West Hills Community Plan and the Warner Center Specific Plan”* [sic]

Comment- Some important Issues with regard to these documents and other city documents need to be addressed as follows-

1. Warner Center Specific Plan -

A. The Owensmouth Parkway- This area is defined as “The area along Owensmouth Avenue between Vanowen Street on the north and the Ventura Freeway on the south.” The Specific Plan states that along Owensmouth “activities and spaces.....should be street oriented rather than internally focused within a development.”

- The Member Only Fueling Station is contrary to this premise.

B. Minimum Setbacks- The minimum setback along Victory Boulevard is 25' and Erwin is 40' from the property line.

- These setbacks should be adhered to.

C. Automobile and/or Truck Rental and Sales, New and Used- These functions are prohibited in the Specific Plan.

- An exception is being requested.

Response to Comment No. 25-33

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-17 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan. The project site's setbacks are 25 feet along both Victory Boulevard and Erwin Street. A 40-foot setback along the project's frontage on Owensmouth Avenue, where new construction is proposed, will be observed. Auto sales are a permitted use under the Specific Plan in the project site's (WC)C2 zone and are not prohibited. The project is not seeking an exception for auto sale uses and is only seeking a conditional use permit to extend the hours of operation of the auto sales use.

Comment No. 25-34

2. Draft Commercial Design Guidelines-

A. The Guidelines state, "Place drive through elements away from primary site corners and adjacent private streets."

- The Member Only Fueling Station does not meet this guideline.

B. The Guidelines state, "Ensure that commercial ground floor uses provide clear and unobstructed windows....."

- The Anchor Retailer wall along Victory Boulevard does not meet this guideline.

C. The Guidelines state, "Where alternatives to surface parking lots are not feasible, locate parking lots at the interior of the block, not at corner locations. Reserve corner locations for buildings."

- Although the surface parking lot is located at the interior of the site, the Member Only Fueling Station does not meet the intent of this guideline.

D. The Guidelines state, “Wrap parking structures with active uses such as retail or housing units on the ground floor.”

- The large parking structure located along Westfield Way does not meet this guideline.

Response to Comment No. 25-34

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-5 for a discussion of the project’s consistency with the objectives of the Draft Citywide Commercial Design Guidelines.

Comment No. 25-35

25. Page 34, Item 9.B.b.13)(b)- “Cumulative Impacts”-

Comment- All cumulative impact sections of this DEIR should consider some possible development on the Pratt and Whitney Site and the Catalina Yacht Site, as well as the New Warner Center Specific Plan EIR and the Pierce College Master Plant EIR. Reasonable assumptions could be made for the still pending sites similar to some of the Related Projects that have been used in this DEIR to date.

Response to Comment No. 25-35

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-46 regarding the cumulative impact analysis within the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 25-36

26. Page 45, Item 9.B.a.(4)- “...and changing transportation and land use patterns to reduce auto dependence. The project has incorporated project design features that would advance these objectives.”

Comment- Providing a 20 pump [sic] Member Only Fueling Station with queuing capacities of up to 62 cars, with their engines running, seems contrary to these objectives, especially the reduction of auto dependence. The provision of bike lanes, bike racks and showers, ride share/TDM programs, HOV parking, Carpool parking, charging stations, etc. in no way equalizes the affect this Fueling Station has on the promotion of Auto dependence. This

station will be offering fuel at below market prices encouraging the negative behavior even more.

Response to Comment No. 25-36

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-49.

Comment No. 25-37

27. Page 47, Item 9.B.c(2)- *“.....designing a majority of the project....to achieve the Silver rating under the.....LEED Rating System.....with the exception of the Anchor Retailer achieving a LEED certification.”*

Comment- The Anchor retailer should not be the exception to a Silver rating considering they are the ones bringing the Fuel Station and the large the [sic] Surface parking lot to the project.

Response to Comment No. 25-37

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-16. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-38

28. Page 47, Item 9.B.c.(2)- *“Land uses that also serve to reduce vehicle trips”* [sic]

Comments- The fueling station? See comment for page 45.

Response to Comment No. 25-38

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-49.

Comment No. 25-39

29. Page 47, Item 9.B.c.(2)- *“...providing accessibility to multiple public transportation lines”* [sic]

Comment- As previously noted, a better pedestrian path connecting the center of the project with the bus station on Owens mouth needs to be provided.

Response to Comment No. 25-39

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project site's pedestrian connectivity from public transit.

Comment No. 25-40

30. Page 52 and 53, Item 9.C.a.(3)- *"Each UST would be constructed of double walled construction.....would be placed 16 feet bgs....In the northeast corner of the project site.....ground water was encountered in exploratory borings at approximately 17 to 18 feet bgs."*

Comment- New borings should be taken in the next two months now that a rainy season has occurred. The borings should be located precisely where the tanks are proposed to be installed. Double walling of tanks should be considered a preventive measure and leak detection systems a reactive measure. However, if the tanks are actually going to be placed in the water table, then reconsideration of tank placement or even reconsideration of the proposed Fueling Station use within the project in general should take place. There are an abundance of fueling stations in the vicinity (15 within 1.5miles [sic], 8 within .75 miles [sic] and a large fueling station is located about ¼ mile away at the corner of Victory and Topanga, across the street from the project.) Considering the risks if the tanks need to be in the water table and the other issues (planning and environmental) associated with this fueling station, support of its inclusion would be questionable at best.

Response to Comment No. 25-40

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for more information regarding the safety measures associated with the fuel station and underground storage tanks, as well as the groundwater levels in the location of the fuel station.

Comment No. 25-41

31. Page 62, Item 9.E.a.(1)(a)- *"the project would provide adequate and well designed parking facilities."*

Comment- Facades [sic] of the parking garage have not been presented. Active uses at the ground floor of the parking garage facing Westfield Way would better contribute to the overall pedestrian theme being stated as the intent for this project and better meet the City of Los Angeles Commercial Design Guidelines as stated in a previous comment. The east and west facades are 850' feet [sic] long. Large recessed areas in the east and west facades [sic] are suggested where pedestrian paths and vehicles entries occur. These recesses will serve to break up the façade and the overall mass of the building. Also the

recesses serve to shorten the interior portion of the pedestrian path that transverses the parking structure. The recesses should be a full parking space in depth and a width that provides uncovered open air to the sky for a width of the entry roads plus setbacks on each side for a five foot sidewalk and 15' of landscape buffer. If active uses at the first floor are incorporated at these locations, the setbacks could be reduced and the sidewalk width increased.

The parking structures are unnecessarily tall as previously stated.

Response to Comment No. 25-41

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the design of the project site's parking structure, including exhibits showing the façades of the parking structure.

Comment No. 25-42

Surface parking occurs that separates Owensmouth Avenue from the rest of the project. Adjust the layout of this surface parking to allow the pedestrian to be encouraged to use an obvious, convenient, pleasant and safe path as discussed in previous comments. Reduce the amount of driveways crossing this pedestrian path.

Response to Comment No. 25-42

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's connectivity from Owensmouth Avenue.

Comment No. 25-43

32. Page 63, Item 9.E.a.(1)(b)- *"...The Draft City Wide Urban Design Guidelines.....the project would generally be consistent with the draft guidelines."*

Comment- Although admirable aesthetic fixes have been proposed to mediate what are basic planning flaws, the remedies are not sufficient and the guidelines only point this out. Refer to Comment Page 31, Item 9.A.a.(1)(b)2, No 2.- Draft Commercial Design Guidelines.

Response to Comment No. 25-43

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-5 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the objectives of the Draft Citywide Commercial Design Guidelines.

Comment No. 25-44

33. Page 64, Item 9.E.a.(c)- *“the project’s design and proposed streetscape improvements would be consistent with the Specific Plan requirements regarding Owensmouth Parkway.”*

Comment- Refer to Comment Page 31, Item 9.A.a.(1)(b)2., No. 1A . [sic] The fueling station location and the proposed setbacks do not meet the intent of this element.

Response to Comment No. 25-44

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-43 for a discussion of the fueling station’s consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines.

Comment No. 25-45

34. Page 64, Item 9.E.a.(1)- *“the project would voluntarily be consistent with the primary goals of the Proposed Draft Specific Plan”*. [sic]

Comment- The response to this statement must be qualified with the statement that there are some parts of the proposed project, especially the use of materials and much of the architectural design, that are consistent with the goals of the plan. However, there are parts of the project that could, but still do not, meet some of the most important and primary goals of the plan and in fact are in direct conflict with it.

A. *“Orient projects to provide convenient access to the nearest transit options (orange line, bus, or local transit) wherever possible.* [sic]

Comment- As stated in previous comments, the bus stop at Owensmouth is not provided with an adequate connection to the project.

B. *“Site taller structures along the major corridors where their visual presence can serve as focal points within the district and reinforce the street wall.”*

Comment- The office building conflicts with this. It is not located along the two major corridors Victory or Topanga.

C. *“Locate parking structures that serve the development or the district underground, in a podium wrapped by habitable uses or in above ground structures with active ground floor uses along street frontages.....”*

Comment- The parking structure proposed does not meet any of these options. There are ways to activate parts of the ground floor of this structure that would not create 'bad' retail space. This is a serious flaw in the proposed project. For instance, locating restaurant space on each side of the highly traveled main vehicular entrance to this parking structure would create an activated space and highly visible retail. It would help to reinforce the pedestrian path shown at this location as well.

D. *"Line required new, small streets with active uses wherever possible so they contribute to a pedestrian oriented street."*

Comment- Westfield Way, the main new private street, between the retail buildings and the parking structure does not meet this requirement. The retail buildings 'back' on to this street and no part of the parking structure is activated. This is what has been referred to as a pedestrian dead zone.

E. *"Neighborhood retail is encouraged and should be visibly concentrated at primary street corners, internal street corners, or facing onto public-private open spaces or paseos."*

Comment- The gas station is located at a primary corner and conflicts with the intent of this part of the proposed plan. The intent is to use corners as emphasis points, not to create voids in massing, use and activation at these locations.

F. *"Provide wall openings i.e. store front windows and doors, on at least 60% of a buildings street level façade below a height of ten feet."*

Comment- The anchor store is up against Victory Boulevard with a wall that is over 400 feet long. The entire façade has 0% store front windows and or doors. This is in direct conflict to the plan's intent.

G. *"Use clear glass for wall openings along all street level facades for maximum transparency, especially in conjunction with retail uses. Dark tinted, reflective or opaque glazing is not permitted for any required wall opening along street level facades."*

Comment- Since the anchor store façade does not meet the opening requirements with in [sic] ten feet of grade, it obviously does not meet this requirement.

H. *"Locate loading docks, electrical transformers, mechanical and other equipment so that they are not in the setback, or visible from a public or required private street....."*

Comment- Other Costco's, the current proposed Anchor Retailer, were surveyed and it was found that box bailers, and the broken down boxes, trash enclosures, and other storage happens outside. Since the current design of the project has all facades of this Anchor Retailer being visible to the public (there is no back side), these functions need to occur in the interior of the building or in an enclosure with a roof to meet the intent of this statement in the proposed Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 25-45

Please refer to Response to Comment 18-51 for a discussion of the project's voluntary consistency with the primary urban planning goals of the Proposed Draft Specific Plan. In addition, the area immediately east of the anchor tenant allows for the proper disposal of refuse, loading of merchandise, and safe vehicular passage. Wooden pallets will be stored for pick up within the store and in exterior areas screened from view. Refuse from the anchor retailer would be collected in an enclosed space, as necessary, several times per week. Specific details regarding storage, disposal, and loading of merchandise will be provided during the entitlement process.

Comment No. 25-46

35. Page 65, Item 9.E.a.(1)(e)- *“The project would comply with a majority of the principal's presented in the City's Walkability Checklist”* [sic]

Comment- It is recognized that no one project can meet all the requirements of this list in all areas but conclusions can be made that the major intents of the list are not being met as stated below. In general, the west portion of the site plan meets these requirements and the east portion does not (the big box anchor retail store, the fueling station, the surface parking lot and the large parking structure).

A. *“The purpose of the Guidance for Site Plan Reviewworking with developers to make developments more walkable, that is to enhance pedestrian activity, access, comfort and safety”* [sic]

Comment- This is a broad statement and many of the previous comments show that there are shortfalls that need concentrated effort. The surface parking lot needs small reconfiguring to allow less uncontrolled pedestrian/vehicular conflicts to occur.

Response to Comment No. 25-46

As cited above and described in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project would comply with the majority of the provisions of the City's Walkability

Checklist. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5 and in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been specifically designed as a walkable outdoor mixed-use project. Refer to Figures II-6, II-28, and II-29 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, and the internal pedestrian access graphic provided in Topical Response No. 5. As shown in the internal pedestrian access graphic provided in Topical Response No. 5, the primary pedestrian path through the surface parking area would be clearly demarcated so as to minimize pedestrian/vehicular conflicts.

Comment No. 25-47

B. "The primary entrance for pedestrians should be at grade level from the public way and be easily accessible from transit stops with as direct a path as possible to the transit stop. Retail establishments should maintain at least one entrance from the public way with doors unlocked during business hours."

Comment- As previously stated the conflicts to this occur along Victory with the Anchor Retailer and because of the fueling station and surface parking lot disconnecting Owensmouth from the main part of the project.

Response to Comment No. 25-47

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 18-53 through 18-55. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project's pedestrian connections from Owensmouth Avenue into the project.

Comment No. 25-48

C. "...mid-block passageways or paseos should be active, visually interesting spaces and safe."

Comment- Again, the pedestrian connections through the surface parking lots and the lack of activation on Westfield way do not meet the intent of this statement.

Response to Comment No. 25-48

As shown in Figure III-3 in Topical Response No. 5, primary pedestrian connections through the surface parking lots would be visually interesting and safe. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, the central parking structure and adjacent retail uses have been designed such that they are linked together so that the retail engages the lower two levels of the parking directly, which will ease the movement of pedestrians to the retail areas.

Comment No. 25-49

D. “Enhance pedestrian comfort and safety by providing views into buildings and beyond the street wall.”

Comment- The anchor retailer along Victory and the retail spaces along Westfield way [sic] do not meet this.

Response to Comment No. 25-49

The building façade goals listed in the City’s Walkability Checklist are as follows: “(1) Incorporate features on the building façade that add visual interest to the environment; (2) Create compatibility between buildings, street, and neighborhood through architectural elements that add scale and character; (3) Provide views beyond the street wall to enhance the public’s visual environment; and (4) Use building elements to enhance comfort and security of pedestrians.” The project, including the anchor retailer, would be consistent with these goals.

The anchor retailer would incorporate a number of building façade features that add visual interest to the environment, create compatibility with the street through architectural elements that add scale and character, and use building elements to enhance the comfort of pedestrians. The project has designed buildings along public streets to be pedestrian-scaled and of visual interest by incorporating design details, such as the articulation of building façades, the use of overhangs, multi-faced roof forms, and quality materials, to ensure that buildings are welcoming from the street.

Specific to the anchor retailer along Victory Boulevard, to create variety and interest along the Victory frontage, the anchor retail building would use a variety of materials that provide texture and visual interest. In order to reduce the overall massing of the building, the wall plane along Victory Boulevard includes several full-height setbacks of the building façade and a variety of projecting canopies and tower elements. The overall distance between these projections and recesses varies to provide visual interest to the overall composition. In addition, the Victory Boulevard façade would include a combination of elements, such as sculpted, carved, or penetrated wall surface; planters; murals; mosaics; public art; awnings; and lighting. In addition, the use of trellises along the anchor retailer’s street elevation would also help engage the landscape into the building design and provide strong shadow lines that create a more interesting elevation. At the driveway closest to Owensmouth Avenue, a landscaped screening wall would be added in front of the northeastern corner of the building which extends 12 feet from the building wall. Dual towers would punctuate the corners of the building, which would minimize the horizontality

of the building mass and help to accentuate these corners as visual markers along the Victory frontage.

The project would, thus, be consistent with the building façade goals of the City's Walkability Checklist.

Comment No. 25-50

E. "At corners, the building frontage should consider building cutoffs in response to any need to accommodate pedestrians and to protect pedestrian safety, security and enjoyment."

Comment- Provide these cutoffs at the retail buildings along Westfield Way. This would shorten the inactivated length and be a contributor (along with other items previously mentioned) to make the space more 'defensible.' The retail buildings along the main Topanga Canyon site access road should have cut offs [sic] added on the Topanga side of those buildings. The other corners have them. Also if recessed entrances to the garage are introduced as previously mentioned, the cutoffs should be provided there as well.

Response to Comment No. 25-50

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's pedestrian-oriented design details.

Comment No. 25-51

F. "In non-residential uses, most (i.e. [sic] 75%) of the ground floor building façade should be devoted to pedestrian entrances, pedestrian-level display windows and/or pedestrian-level windows affording views into and out of the building interior."

Comment- This is not being met in the current façade proposal along Victory Boulevard.

Response to Comment No. 25-51

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-53 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 25-52

G. "When pedestrians have to determine their own path through driveways and parking lots, confusion and conflicts between pedestrians and motorists will result."

Comment- The pedestrian paths being presented through the surface parking and parking structures from Owensmouth, including the bus stop, to the center core of the project do not meet this requirement as previously stated in other comments.

H. *“Prevent auto-pedestrian conflicts”* [sic]

Comment- There are numerous uncontrolled conflicts occurring in the surface parking lot.

Response to Comment No. 25-52

As shown in Figure III-3 in Topical Response No. 5, the primary pedestrian connection from Owensmouth Avenue through the surface parking lots would be clearly demarcated to minimize conflicts with pedestrians and vehicles. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the pedestrian connectivity from Owensmouth Avenue.

Comment No. 25-53

I. *“Where incorporated, mid-block passageways or paseos should be active, visually interesting, and safe places, and include features such as furniture, various textures, various architectural features, public art, information kiosks displays, pedestrian level lighting.”*

Comment- This is accommodated in many parts of the plan. Westfield Way totally misses the intent of this statement between the parking structure and the ‘back’ of the retail buildings as currently presented.

Response to Comment No. 25-53

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project’s pedestrian activation, including how the parking structure will be integrated with the retail uses.

Comment No. 25-54

36. Page 71, Item 9.E.a.(2)(c)- *“Such improvements would create an active pedestrian friendly environment.”*

Comment- The improvements proposed are landscape architecture features that will visually improve the experience of driving through the area. However it’s the lack of active uses and penetrations into the site along these paths that will cause the street to be inactive. The transit stops are the only real reason to use these streets based on the

current plan. Locate active uses along these streets to make your statement true or if this is not feasible at least create better connectivity to the transit stops and revise this statement to better reflect what will be achieved.

Response to Comment No. 25-54

As discussed and illustrated in Topical Response No. 5, and illustrated in Figures II-28 and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed to promote pedestrian access throughout and around the project site. Specifically, active retail uses, landscaped open-space areas, and designated pedestrian paths penetrating through the project site with various amenities would encourage pedestrian activity. In addition, bus stops adjacent to the site would be improved, and the new pedestrian paths and multi-use trails would lead directly from bus stops at the perimeter of the site to the interior of the project site.

Comment No. 25-55

37. Page 71, Item 9.E.a.(2)(c)- *“In addition design elements would screen the member only fueling station within the northeast portion of the project site from adjacent uses.”*

Comment- The fueling station canopies will be very tall and thus more quantity, taller and denser landscaping needs to be proposed. Currently the layout of the fueling station pumps is angled to be parallel with Victory Boulevard. Move the easterly pumps back away from the intersection of Owensmouth and Victory more and create a deeper buffer and thus a higher berm. Propose more mature trees that are evergreen. Also, use as many of the large existing trees to guarantee the screening as needed at this location if deemed appropriate and if evergreen. The screening should be visually successful at the time of occupancy of the Phase I of the project.

Response to Comment No. 25-55

The current location of the fueling station pumps allows for the maximum number of cars to be accommodated on-site, avoiding queuing onto Owensmouth Avenue. The fueling station will be largely screened by walls and bermed landscaping elements; however, the fuel station’s canopy will be partially visible from some vantage points. Architecturally, the canopy will be designed to be consistent with the rest of the project and consistent with the materials and articulation of the anchor building. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the screening of the fuel station. Please also refer to Figures III-10 in Topical Response No. 5 for a conceptual illustration of the fueling station canopy.

Comment No. 25-56

38. Page 71, Item 9.E.a.(2)(e)- *“...the project would not substantially or adversely change the existing relationship between on- and off-site land uses and properties,....”*

The footprint of the Anchor Retailer and its position along Victory Boulevard will be the longest wall that is that close to the street in all of Warner Center and in fact in all of Woodland Hills except for two exceptions that should not be allowed to happen again. The Target on Ventura Boulevard is 550 feet long but varies in its setback from 36' to 90' from the street curb. The parking structure at Westfield's Topanga Mall across the street from the proposed project is 1039 feet long but does have numerous openings in its façade. Neither of the other two projects found, had any notable pedestrian activity at the street and are considered by many as some of the worst examples of planning and environment in the area. Also the applicant's own bad example should not be allowed to set a precedent for more of the same. Any other large structure in the area is set back much further, has windows and/or penetrations and very large recesses along their facades [sic] and/or have active uses along the street. The pattern of the area is also where backs to retail face the street (which is not a supported practice currently by planning) the length of the facades [sic] are much, much shorter and penetrations into the site are provided. The portion of the retail center on the adjacent block to the east is just over half the length of the wall proposed for the Anchor Retailer.

Response to Comment No. 25-56

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the façade of the anchor retailer and streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 25-57

39. Page 73, Item 9.F.a.(1)- *“The maximum noise levels generated by impact pile driving....”*

Comment- Explain why drilled piles can't be used. Are there water issues preventing it?

Response to Comment No. 25-57

As described in more detail under Response to Comment No. 17-40, the use of drilled piles was evaluated, but was ruled out for a variety of reasons. Drilled piles are slower to use and therefore would result in construction noise impacts lasting longer than with impact pile driving. Drilled piles are also more difficult to construct because of the shallow groundwater and sandy soils present in the subsurface on-site. In addition, other pile driving options were evaluated, including screw-type pilings, and were also found to be

infeasible for the project site. Specifically, similar to drilled piles, screw-type pilings are slower to use and may not be feasible given the depth of groundwater and the corrosive nature of the soils at the project site.

Comment No. 25-58

40. Page 103, Item 9.H.a.(2)(a)- *“The following list identifies the intersections projected to be significantly impacted”* [sic]

Comment- Why wasn't the intersection at Winnetka and Victory and also the intersection at Oxnard and Winnetka included in the study. [sic] This was pointed out in a meeting with a representative of the applicant over two years ago and the representative said those intersections would be added.

Response to Comment No. 25-58

The intersection study area was developed by measuring the potential impact of the project traffic on key intersections. Intersections along Winnetka Avenue were also reviewed to determine whether there would be enough project traffic added to the intersections along this corridor to create a possible significant impact. If so, the intersections along Winnetka Avenue would be added to the study. Because of the directional distribution of project traffic and the tendency of project traffic to dissipate the farther away one gets from the project site, it was determined that the intersections along Winnetka would not experience enough project traffic to cause a significant impact. Therefore, the intersections were not added as study intersections. The boundaries of the study area were expanded until there were no more significant impacts at the intersections on any of the boundaries of the study area.

Comment No. 25-59

41. Page 118 and 119, Item 9.H.(c).(2)(b)- *“Mitigation Measures 19....., 22....., 23.....”* and *“26.....”* “and any others” [sic]

Comment- These mitigations seem to be tentative at best. Under the conditions that these mitigations or any other ones are not undertaken, what happens? What are the options? Are in lieu fees paid? If so to where? Warner Center Trust? Should other contingency improvements be studied and included to insure real mitigation is achieved?

Response to Comment No. 25-59

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-60.

Comment No. 25-60**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

General comment- Although many of the comments in the previous section are relevant to statements in this section, the comments for the most part will not be repeated.

1. Page 135, Item A- “a mixed use lifestyle development” [sic]

Comment- One could argue that the project is not mixed use but multi-use in the strictest form of the term because of its differing uses [sic] be located horizontally instead of vertically. Please state how a lifestyle center can be claimed at this time by giving example committed tenants that would meet the definition of upscale national chain specialty stores and how the Anchor Retailer Costco fits into the definition of conventional or fashion specialty department stores. Conventional department stores are able to function in a multistory format.

*“**Definition of Lifestyle Center:** Most often located near affluent residential neighborhoods, this center type caters to the retail needs and “lifestyle” pursuits of consumers in its trading area. It has an open-air configuration and typically includes at least 50,000 sq. ft. of space occupied **by upscale national chain specialty stores.** Other elements help make the lifestyle center serve as a multipurpose, leisure-time destination, including: restaurants and entertainment; design ambience and amenities such as fountains and street furniture that are conducive to casual browsing; and often one or more **conventional or fashion specialty department stores** as anchors.”*

Response to Comment No. 25-60

The proposed hotel and office uses are vertically stacked over retail, rather than contained in discreet, horizontally segregated structures. The retail along Topanga Canyon Boulevard and in the center of the site will also be multi-story. An upscale national specialty store, Crate & Barrel, already exists on the site and provides an example of the types of upscale retailers that are anticipated at the project site.

Comment No. 25-61

2. Page 148, Item D.3- “....locate an anchor retailer at the project site in a high visibility location to a public street to contribute to the initial draw for shoppers to visit the project and explore its diversity of uses.”

Comment- The assumption could be that the way the project is currently shown is the only way to meet this important project objective. This seems to be an exaggerated solution to providing the Anchor Tenant with visibility that doesn't meet the existing, projected or general urban planning patterns that were supported by requested alternate solutions by the community (this is not specifically referring only to Alternate Plan F contained in this DEIR but many other options that have been discussed). If the only way to provide this objective is to take a big box store and make it the predominant, closest and biggest element in the entire neighborhood, then one should consider the motives of the tenant's requirements as broaching selfishness.

Response to Comment No. 25-61

An anchor retailer is a critical component of all of the Applicant's developments and is a traditional part of most shopping centers. Anchor retail stores, which can be department stores or a major retail chain, are used to provide the primary draw for people to visit a shopping center, therefore it is critical that they be provided in a high visibility location. The Applicant determined that the location proposed for the anchor retailer building allowed for enough land area to properly present and complement the mix of uses along Topanga Canyon Boulevard. Further, the anchor retailer building has been designed to include a number of distinctive architectural features to provide visual draw to the articulation of the anchor retailer building in a favorable manner.

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-39 for additional information regarding these design features. The proposed anchor retailer would be designed to comply with existing land use policies. The incorporation of a meandering sidewalk, a multi-purpose trail, gateway elements, artistic murals and mature landscaping directly address requests of the community and the goals of the proposed Warner Center Specific Plan currently being considered.

Modified site plans proposed by the community were analyzed as Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for more information. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-62

3. Page148 [sic], Item D.4- *"Maximize the visibility of retail tenants....."*

Comment- The proposed scheme and alternate schemes have tenant spaces facing public streets, private streets and pedestrian paseos. The existing Westfield interior malls have

retail that cannot be seen from public streets. It doesn't seem that this objective is achievable in its entirety by any layout being presented. Based on the evidence of the layout and their existing malls, it doesn't seem evident that maximizing the surrounding public streets was attempted in any way what so ever or needs to be. Other wise [sic] parts of Victory and all of Owensmouth are being completely wasted in the proposed scheme.

Response to Comment No. 25-62

The project has been designed to maximize the visibility of retailers both along the public streets and within areas internal to the project site. Anchor retail areas will be visible along both Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Victory Boulevard. The organization of the retail around the gathering spaces internal to the site and in relation to the bounding streets provides each tenant with maximum exposure to potential customers. In addition, as part of the project, improvements along each of the street fronts would be provided. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's pedestrian-oriented open space areas and streetscape improvements along the project site's bounding streets.

Comment No. 25-63

4. **Page 148. Item D.6-** "Provide readily accessible and easily identifiable centrally located retail and parking facilities with shared parking, serving synergistic commercial uses....in order to provide visitors with easy and convenient retail, business, and destination experiences and encourage return visits."

Comment- Sharing parking between synergistic uses should be encouraged. However [sic] sharing parking between Costco customers with oversized grocery carts and oversized parking spaces with the type of retailer and restaurants appropriate for a mixed use lifestyle development will not encourage return visits. Also, the amount of activity that the Anchor Retailer will produce will tend to dominate the lower levels of the parking structure and the surface parking. The Anchor Retailer will be frustrated and inconvenienced by the other retail and restaurant customers taking close, convenient spaces. Provide an explanation as to how all of this will be controlled. Also, will this really be shared parking in the final analysis?

Again [sic] the idea that centralized parking is more convenient than decentralized parking is debatable. Many find a visit to Santa Monica or Pasadena much more enjoyable than visiting the Topanga Mall. Both can work if set up correctly. All are tough during the holidays.

Response to Comment No. 25-63

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-63.

Comment No. 25-64

5. **Page 154, Figure II-6-** The following are comments on the Conceptual Site Plan:

A. Can the bus stop on Owensmouth be moved south, closer to the intersection of West Valley Way. This would allow bus riders to cross Owensmouth to other destinations at a controlled intersection with a traffic light. It would reduce conflicts at the site access to the north that would have fuel station customers, fuel trucks, delivery trucks and other customers crossing paths with the pedestrians. Also, the bus rider would be closer to the proposed pedestrian path leading to the core of the proposed project. See comment B.

B. Related to comment 'A' move the bus stop south but only so it is on the south side of the intersection with the site access to the fueling station. Reinforce the path to the core of the project at this location. Provide discernable paving, landscape buffering and reduce the vehicular conflicts along this path. Include a bike path to help complete the multimodal paths scheme. This access would align better with the gathering space at the end of the retail paseo where the Costco entrance is proposed.

Response to Comment No. 25-64

The bus stop at Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard serves as a transfer point between lines on Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard. Relocation of this stop towards the south would be prohibitive to convenient transfers. Transit riders now have the opportunity to utilize the existing crosswalks at the intersection.

The bus stop location on Owensmouth Avenue, south of Victory Boulevard is within a 325 foot long auxiliary lane with access to the fueling station only; this bus stop would not disrupt through traffic during normal operation. Relocation of the bus stop south of the fueling station driveway would result in placement within a through traffic lane; normal operation of the bus stop would result in the disruption of southbound through traffic.

Comment No. 25-65

C. Create a larger buffer zone from Victory and Owensmouth to screen the fueling station. Refer to the comment on Page 71, Item 9.E.a.(2)(c).

Response to Comment No. 25-65

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the screening of the proposed fuel station.

Comment No. 25-66

D. For the box bailing and back of house/ storage items see the comment on Page 64, Item 9.E.a.(1)- Comment 'H'. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-66

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-45.

Comment No. 25-67

E. The most northern site access along Topanga and along Owensmouth and the most eastern site access along Victory seem too close to the adjacent intersections. Please justify this.

Response to Comment No. 25-67

The Owensmouth Avenue driveway to the fueling station is located approximately 325 feet south of the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue/Victory Boulevard. The Victory Boulevard driveway used by vehicles exiting the fueling station is located approximately 220 feet west of the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue/Victory Boulevard. These driveways are located sufficiently distant from the adjacent intersection and are not anticipated to present conflicts for pedestrians. The location of these site access points has been reviewed by LADOT. The design and location of these project driveways are not expected to result in any significant impacts.

Comment No. 25-68

F. Provide cut offs on the retail buildings at more locations. See comment on Page 65, Item 9.E.a.(1)(e)- Comment 'E'. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-68

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's pedestrian-oriented design details.

Comment No. 25-69

G. As shown in Alternate Plan 'F' (The Site Plan Proposed by the Community) shown in this DEIR, can an urban space be provided that faces Topanga to guarantee activation of the side of the project facing toward the community? This would also provide relief to the alignment of the facades along the boulevard as well.

Response to Comment No. 25-69

As described in Topical Response No. 5, the project includes four pedestrian entries from Topanga Canyon Boulevard. Topanga Canyon Boulevard will have one pedestrian entry at the mid-block and three others between the mid-point and the corner; pedestrians will also access the Topanga Canyon Boulevard side of the project site from the western Victory Boulevard and the western Erwin Street pedestrian entries. Pedestrians will have a choice of walking along the front of the Topanga Canyon Boulevard retail, or entering the core of the project's retail and pedestrian courtyard areas. A wide sidewalk is proposed to extend along the front of the retail buildings, set back from the street, which will have landscaping, lighting, and streetscape amenities such as seating. This will allow pedestrians to stroll this "paseo" and be shielded from Topanga Canyon Boulevard by significant landscaping. Alternatively, a multipurpose trail will be provided next to Topanga Canyon Boulevard. In addition, along Topanga Canyon Boulevard, the sidewalk may be provided along the Topanga Canyon Boulevard retail to provide a wider buffer between the sidewalk and the public street. The multi-use trail will accommodate a variety of non-vehicular modes of travel, including bikes. Other pedestrian amenities that will be provided along the streetscapes include canopies and trellises for shade, pedestrian-scaled lighting, and trash receptacles.

Comment No. 25-70

H. The parking structure façade is too long. Provide one or two deep recesses to break up this building's length. Provide cutoffs at these recesses. Provide activated space at the ground floor at the primary entrance to the parking garage (from Topanga) on the west side.

Response to Comment No. 25-70

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the parking structure's façade and activated ground floor space.

Comment No. 25-71

I. Can the outdoor eating space outside Costco be open to more than just members only?

Response to Comment No. 25-71

Purchase of food in the food court will be open to the public, and not restricted to members of the anchor retailer.

Comment No. 25-72

J. The existing office building on Owensmouth, see Comment on Page 21, Item 5.

Response to Comment No. 25-72

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-42.

Comment No. 25-73

K. The façade of the Anchor retailer along Victory see comment on Page 15, Item 4.E.

Response to Comment No. 25-73

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building's Victory Boulevard design. Please also refer to Response to Comment No. 25-41.

Comment No. 25-74

L. The other facades [sic] of the Anchor retailer [sic] need to be presented and have a similar level of design as the façade along Victory.

M. The parking garage facades [sic] need to be presented and respond to the issues included in the comment on Page 62, Item 9.E.a.(1)(a).

Response to Comment No. 25-74

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building's Victory Boulevard design, including figures showing the other façades of the anchor retail building. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the parking structure's façade.

Comment No. 25-75

N. Will a bike/ multi-module path be provided on Erwin? Other figures seem to imply this, but it doesn't seem to be shown.

Response to Comment No. 25-75

A multi-use path will be provided on Erwin Street. Please refer to Figure II-22 and Figure II-23, in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 25-76

6. **Page 159, Figure II-11-** This rendering shows opportunities for super graphics and/or billboard elements. Signage needs to be worked out in more detail. Provide the necessary qualification statements in this DEIR that make these elements tentative and based on further discussions with City Planning and the community.

Response to Comment No. 25-76

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-65 for a discussion of the project's proposed signage.

Comment No. 25-77

7. **Page 162, Figure II-13-** Another tower element within this facade [sic] may further help break up the horizontality of the mass.

Labeling of the materials and adding dimensions to the plan and elevations should be undertaken as this building mass, setbacks, materials, height, etc. [sic] have been part of the center of controversy and one of the main aesthetic effects related to the analysis in this DEIR. Details and commitments for this area of the project are critical to the analysis required.

In other parts of this document, the original intent of adhering to the required 25' setback along Victory Boulevard seems to have been reevaluated by the applicant to achieve a more undulated façade at this location. This needs to be presented in a more straight forward manner and justified. It would seem logical, because of the sheer mass of this building, that the undulating façade and the adherence to the required setback should be pursued.

Response to Comment No. 25-77

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building's Victory Boulevard design and the refined site plans, including exhibits showing the façades of the anchor retailer building. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for more information regarding the project's consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan. As described in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project is consistent with all required setbacks.

Comment No. 25-78

8. Page 166, Item E.3- *Multiple Areas of Concern*

Comment- See the previous comments regarding all the issues appearing on this page. In particular, of special note are the comments regarding the Community Center on Page 10, Item 4,A.b.

Response to Comment No. 25-78

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-34.

Comment No. 25-79

9. Page 170, Item E.5- *Multiple Areas of Concern-*

Comment- See the previous comments regarding all the issues appearing on this page.

Response to Comment No. 25-79

The previous comments referred to in this comment have been responded to as part of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 25-80

10. Page 171, Figure II-17- Provide a full build out of the street elements in a Prephase I Phase to mitigate the lack of completion in the southern half of the site in case the projected Proposed Phase two schedule elongates or never happens. Provide for a deadline for Phase II ground breaking before trees would need to be planted per the Warner Center Specific Plan in the surface parking lot. Also, because of the extensive phasing work proposed at the parking structure, present a Phase I façade and a Phase II façade in this DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 25-80

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos, 18-66 and 17.21 for a discussion of full buildout of the project's streetscape elements as part of Phase 1, and for a discussion of the timing to plant trees as part of the Phase 1 surface parking areas. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the parking structure's façade.

Comment No. 25-81

11. Pages 172 through 175, Figures II-18 through 21- Multiple Areas of Concern-

Comment- See the previous comments regarding all the issues appearing in these figures.

Response to Comment No. 25-81

The previous comments referred to in this comment have been responded to as part of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 25-82

12. Page 176, Item E.5- “.....surface parking areas would include large canopy trees.....”

Comment- Provide the size of the large canopy trees at the time of planting. This is a statement that implies a commitment to the community and the city but is too broad in its content.

Response to Comment No. 25-82

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-21 for a discussion of the trees that would be provided in the project's surface parking areas as required by the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 25-83

13. Page 176, Item E.5- “.....a minimum 15' wide landscaped setback area.”

Comment- See comments on Page 162, Figure II-13 and Page 31, Item 9.A.a.(1)(b)2.

Response to Comment No. 25-83

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-32 and Topical Response 5.

Comment No. 25-84

14. Page 178, Item E.5- *“From the Westfield Topanga Shopping Center to the north, a dedicated tree lined walking path would bring the pedestrian to the signalized intersection at Victory Boulevard.”*

Comment- Refer to the comment on Page 6, Item 4.A. and provide a plan of the layout.

Response to Comment No. 25-84

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project site’s pedestrian connections.

Comment No. 25-85

15. Page 184, Figure 11I28 and Page 185, Figure II-29- *Multiple Areas of Concern-*

Comment- All issues have been previously commented on. Briefly and in broad terms, the pedestrian paths and multi-use trails through the surface parking and parking structures are not sufficiently defined, safe, defensible, have too many uncontrolled vehicular conflicts. There is no good connection to the bus stop on Owensmouth. The natural path from Owensmouth is not being recognized and designed for. There are pedestrian dead zones all over this site plan, if not eliminated, could at least be mitigated more (on Westfield Way, along Owensmouth, along Victory, and through the large surface parking lot).

Response to Comment No. 25-85

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project site’s pedestrian connections.

Comment No. 25-86

16. Page 188, Item E.7- *“.....would employ a consistent design theme pursuant to the Uniform Sign Program as part of the entitlement process.”*

Comment- See the comment on Page 159, Figure II-11 [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-86

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-65.

Comment No. 25-87

17. Page 192, Figure II-31-

Comment- Erwin and Owensmouth should be avoided because of residential uses on these streets.

Response to Comment No. 25-87

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-33.

Comment No. 25-88

18. 18. [sic] Page 194, Item F-

Comment- See the comment on Page 19, Item I.

Response to Comment No. 25-88

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-29.

Comment No. 25-89

III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Overview of Environmental Setting

No comments for this section.

Response to Comment No. 25-89

This comment references other comments that have been responded to as part of this Final EIR or indicates that the Commentor has no comments on a particular section of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 25-90

B. Related Projects

1. Page 210, Item B-

Comment- See comment on Page 34, Item 9.B.b.(3)(b).

Response to Comment No. 25-90

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-46.

Comment No. 25-91

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. Aesthetics, View, Light and Air

1. Page 214, Item A.2.a.(1)- “....*this pre-existing bank building...*”

Comment- Wasn't this a Movie Theater?

Response to Comment No. 25-91

The bank building located at 21700 Victory Boulevard was removed as part of approval of the Crate and Barrel as stated in the Draft EIR. The movie theater was removed prior to the NOP for the project.

Comment No. 25-92

2. Page 219, photograph 6- “*Two story office.....*”

Comment- See comment pertaining to Page `14, [sic] Item 5.

Response to Comment No. 25-92

It is not clear what specific issue the Commentor is referring to.

Comment No. 25-93

3. Page 221, Item A.2.a.(1)- “....*the suburban Warner Center area*” [sic]

Comment- There are numerous times in the DEIR where Warner Center is referred to as suburban and other times as urban. Coordinate statements and all discussions to be consistent.

Response to Comment No. 25-93

The project area is suburban in nature and referred to as "developed suburban." The Draft EIR has been amended to reflect the use of this term in lieu of the term urban. Please refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 25-94

B. Air Quality

No comments at this time.

C. Geology and Soils

All issues are covered in previous comments.

D. Surface Water Hydrology and Surface Water Quality

No comments at this time.

E. Land Use

All issues are covered in previous comments.

F. Noise

All issues are covered in previous comments.

G. Public Services

No comments at this time.

Volume II

H. Traffic Access, and Parking

All issues are covered in previous comments.

I. Utilities

No comments at this time.

V. ALTERNATIVES

A. Alternative A

No comments at this time.

B. Alternative B

No comments at this time.

Response to Comment No. 25-94

This comment references other comments that have been responded to as part of this Final EIR or indicates that the Commentor has no comments on a particular section of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 25-95

C. Alternative C

Comment- This alternative does not support the vision for Warner Center as a dense urban regional center.

Response to Comment No. 25-95

Per the CEQA Guidelines, the selection of project alternatives should be based primarily on the ability to reduce significant environmental impacts relative to the project. In accordance with CEQA requirements, alternatives which would reduce the environmental impacts of the project were considered in the Draft EIR. Elimination of the office and hotel uses would represent a reduction in development and, therefore, a reduction in environmental impacts. The analysis of this alternative concludes that due to the removal of the office and hotel uses, this alternative would not attain most objectives of the project.

Comment No. 25-96

D. Alternative D

Comment- An alternative where residential uses are added to the project instead of being substituted for the office uses would be an attractive option worth studying.

Response to Comment No. 25-96

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-5 for more information regarding the project alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-97

E. Alternative E

Comment- This alternative does not support the vision for Warner Center as a dense urban regional center.

Response to Comment No. 25-97

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-5 for more information regarding the project alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-98

F. Alternative F

See Part II of these Public Comments for specific responses to these alternatives.

Response to Comment No. 25-98

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-99

G. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Comment- See comment under Alternative E.

Response to Comment No. 25-99

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-95.

Comment No. 25-100

VI. Other CEQA Considerations

Comment- This entire section, including subsections A, B, C, D, E. and F. listed below, was not reviewed due to time limitations and the related deadline extension request of 45 days being reduced to 15 days.

A. Significant Unavoidable Impacts

B. Reasons Why the project is Being proposed, Not withstanding Significant Impacts

C. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

D. Growth Inducing Impacts

E. Potential Secondary Affects

F. Effects not Found to be Significant

VII. MISCELLANEOUS AND APPENDICES COMMENTS

Response to Comment No. 25-100

The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-101**PUBLIC COMMENTS- PART II****V. Alternatives****F. Alternative F- Modified Site Plans**

1. **Page 1029-** Description of the Alternative- *“As concluded below, these modified site plans would not meet many of the project objectives”* [sic]

Response- The responses to each individual specific statement in this Section Alternative F will show that this overall conclusion is not convincingly argued in many areas and with small adjustments, the few areas that could partially support this statement can be modified to meet the reasonable objectives. However in a couple of instances, the objectives are so narrow in the goals stated that they appear to be predicated to a particular solution (The proposed Project). Also, some of the overall goals of the city and the community may conflict with the project goals. It seems prudent while evaluating the environmental impacts that these goals are better worked into the objectives. The jobs and taxes, and the improvement of vacant land are not the only city and community goals that should be included in the objectives.

Response to Comment No. 25-101

The alternatives analysis in the Draft EIR is comprehensive and includes a detailed analysis of the alternatives to the project. In addition, as described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the objectives established by the Applicant incorporate key objectives of the City of Los Angeles' General Plan Framework, the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan, and the Warner Center Specific Plan that are relevant to development of the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-102

2. **Page 1029-** *‘[sic] Modified Site Plan- Anchor Retailer Internal to the Site’* [sic]

Response- The proposal is the same as the *“Proposed Plan”* except that the scheme reflects that the anchor store and its parking have been reversed. This put the parking along Victory Boulevard. Also the parking appears to be in a parking structure along the

main thoroughfare. There are two issues here that become apparent: one is a negative and one a positive.

A negative in this scheme is that a parking structure of the scale and design shown along Victory Boulevard would be detrimental to the potential character of the area.

A positive is that a scheme like this separates the Anchor Retailer's parking from the rest of the shoppers. This practice prevents the Anchor Customers from dominating the more desirable parking and thus reduces the conflicts that may occur in a combined parking concept. Also, reducing this parking conflict problem better guarantees the success of the rest of the project, satisfaction of the customer, encouragement of the customers returning back to the project in the future, and thus reduces the risk of future urban blight.

Response to Comment No. 25-102

As described in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Modified Site Plan – Anchor Retailer Internal to the Site would provide structure parking in two separate structures rather than one centralized structure. In addition, the locations of the publicly accessible open space areas would be modified as a result of the location of the anchor retailer and parking structures. Access to and within the project site would also be modified to account for the locations of the anchor store within the more central portions of the project site.

As discussed in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the layout of the parking structures would not provide readily accessible shared parking to service multiple retailers and would require additional vehicular circulation within the site. Furthermore, this modified design does not comply with the goals of the Proposed Draft Warner Center Specific Plan to locate parking structures internal to the site and to locate retail facilities along public street frontages. Moreover, the Victory Boulevard frontage would be difficult to activate with pedestrian facilities and other design elements, including façade variations, since a parking structure would be located at the edge along Victory Boulevard. Additionally, placement of the anchor retailer internal to the site would increase the turning movements at the proposed signalized driveway on Topanga Canyon Boulevard to the detriment of traffic flow along this State highway. A location along Topanga Canyon Boulevard would also force the taller buildings on the site to be relocated closer to existing housing and away from the other commercial uses in the area. This modified site plan with the anchor retailer internal to the site would also force patrons to travel the full distance of the anchor retailer exterior with shopping carts in order to access the major parking areas, resulting in a greater vehicular/pedestrian conflict.

However, under the project's site plan, the placement and orientation of the anchor retailer within the shopping center has been designed to enhance pedestrian accessibility within the project site by integrating the anchor retailer and its food court and courtyard with the retail and restaurant uses located along Topanga Canyon Boulevard. This orientation would allow the parking lots and parking structures to be located internal to the site, improving the site design from an external view, and would enhance pedestrian access between the anchor retailer and additional retailers at the site, creating a more integrated site design.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-103

3. Page 1032- *"Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community"*

Response- General - The alternative *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"* has not been adequately investigated and the Community was not contacted for explanations of the working of the plan. Therefore mistakes exist in the analysis and are based on incorrect information and inaccurate statements of fact. Parking ratios, heights of buildings, the viability of the retail layout, and the layout as only being relevant to residential development are all based on inaccurate assumptions that once again would seem to reflect investigation that is inadequate and conclusionary. The responses to particular statements will help explain the facts of this plan in more detail to clear up these inaccurate assumptions.

It must be noted at this time, that the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"* was drafted as an example to help the applicant be more open to other ideas, for the community to better understand the opportunities and challenges of the site, and to communicate to local organizations the potential that may be missed if the "Proposed Plan" is built. It was understood that the applicant holds the right and obligation to make their proposal and design the project. The applicant is also obligated to create the best plan possible to meet everyone's needs.

The plan is based on the current WC Specific Plan, the Draft Commercial Design Guidelines, the efforts and proposals currently reflected in the draft Design Standards and Guidelines for the New Warner Center Specific Plan yet to be completed and/or considered by reviewing agencies, input from various Community Groups and Community Activists, and individuals in the field of Urban Planning, Architecture, and Entitlements.

Response to Comment No. 25-103

The description of the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community was derived from the illustration created within the community, as shown in Figure V-6 in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-104

4. Page 1032- *“There are four parking structures....three of which would be wrapped in retail....”*

Response- There are four parking structures being proposed plus levels of parking in the office building. Except for the office building parking, all structures are wrapped with retail/restaurant, office/ commercial tenant space. (The DEIR does not mention the parking in the office tower and does not seem to recognize that the parking adjacent to the Anchor Retailer is also wrapped with the tenant spaces.)

Response to Comment No. 25-104

This comment describes the parking proposed as part of the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community, as described in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. This comment notes that the Draft EIR did not mention the parking associated with the office tower. This correction is identified in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR. Nonetheless, the decentralization of the three parking structures wrapped by retail, the parking structure adjacent to the anchor retailer, and the parking structure connected to the office tower would reduce the efficiencies of and opportunities for shared parking. Therefore, parking would be utilized much less efficiently as compared to the project. As such, the greater operational impacts relative to the project identified in the Draft EIR would still remain.

This comment also notes that the parking structure adjacent to the anchor retailer is considered a wrap-around parking structure. However, this parking structure, as shown in Figure V-6 on page 1033 in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, does not show the typical wrap-around design demonstrated by the three retail/commercial with wrap-around parking buildings in the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-105

5. **Page 1032-** “.....surface parking would be provided throughout the project site.”

Response- Surface parking is proposed but is greatly reduced compared to the “*Proposed Plan*”. [sic] The large surface parking lot adjacent to the anchor retailer has been deleted in the ‘ [sic] *Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community.*”

Response to Comment No. 25-105

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-106

6. **Page 1032-** “*Open space areas would be modified and would not be as centralized when compared with the project.*”

Response- The amount of centralized open space is similar but slightly reduced compared to the “Proposed Project”. [sic] Much more usable open space is provided due to the reduction in the anchor retailer footprint. Also some of the open space was relocated in the same vicinity but facing Topanga Boulevard to better guarantee an activated street frontage that was promised by the applicant in various Community meetings.

Response to Comment No. 25-106

As described in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, based on the modified layout of the buildings and the decentralization of parking, the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would not provide a clear pedestrian orientation or clear pedestrian pathway into and throughout the site when compared to the project. Refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project that optimizes open spaces and walkability.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-107

7. **Page 1034-** The following statements on this page will be responded to individually as follows-

A. *“Specifically this modified site plan with wrap around parking areas, presents a layout that is more appropriate for a residential development where a parking space is needed for only a single destination.”*

Response- Multiple wrap around retail type parking structures can be found in the Colorado Boulevard District of Pasadena Ca. Also, the City of Santa Monica let out Requests for Proposals recently for the reconstruction of their parking structures and in those ‘RFP’s” was a requirement for retail facing the street at the first floor. These structures have additional bays of parking above the retail level. These local examples, residential uses do not occur.

The Los Angeles Department of City Planning Draft Commercial Design Guidelines states under Objective 4: Minimize the Appearance of Driveways and Parking Areas, Subheading: Off-Street Parking and Driveways- *“Wrap parking structures with active uses such as retail spaces or housing units on the ground floor.”* These common planning practices are not included in the *“Proposed Plan”*. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-107

Garages, as depicted in Alternative F, are two bays wide, which is too small to be practical. The referenced garages are typically three bays wide; e.g., the garages along Santa Monica’s Second and Fourth streets. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-5 for more information regarding the project alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 25-108

B. *“The design would not function well for retail uses since it would not provide the customer with convenient access to multiple locations within the individual buildings or in multiple wraparound locations proposed on the site.”*

Response- This brings up an over all [sic] question to begin with. Does the City of Los Angeles and the Community see this site as simply an open air mall or an opportunity to begin a transformation or to truly reinforce the area as a Regional Center. The “ [sic] Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community” is intended to show an example of the creation of a true Village District. All the new streets are activated. Pedestrian dead zones are minimized and defensible space is maximized. Retail is actually closer to parking. This setup can be seen in Santa Monica, Pasadena, Manhattan Beach and many, many other successful districts both locally and across the nation.

The scale of the street experience in more areas is more human in scale and more of the site encourages interaction with fellow passerby. [sic] The Pedestrian paths are much

more defined and appropriate than in the “proposed plan “. [sic] Both the large centralized parking structure of the “Proposed Plan” and this decentralized proposal would be better served and would be served by computerized systems telling the parking customer which areas are full and where parking is available. This is used at the existing large parking structure at Westfield’s Topanga Mall and in Santa Monica at the decentralized parking structures.

As far as walking distances, the decentralized parking shortens walking distances and provides options especially for the customer that has a particular destination in mind. This type of customer, for instance the couple in pursuit of a particular restaurant, can choose the closest parking structure.

Response to Comment No. 25-108

Please refer to Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for more information regarding the infeasibility of the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community. This proposed alternative would also result in several areas where the retail uses would not be activated. Effective retail requires clustering along clearly delineated and populated pedestrian pathways. This alternative leaves many areas where retail uses may not be successful due to the lack of pedestrian exposure. It is more suited to a residential development. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building’s Victory Boulevard design.

Comment No. 25-109

C. *“The retail locations would not be readily available to the passerby since retail would be more concentrated internal to the site.”*

Response- The *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”* has about the same amount of linear footage of retail facing Topanga and Victory Boulevard. The linear footage of retail where the Anchor Store was located in the *“Proposed Plan”* as some what [sic] reduced simply to respond to a negative characteristic of that plan. The over 400’ foot long wall against Victory Boulevard, one could argue is an overstated readily available characteristic that needed to be toned down. The *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”* does just that. It pulls the Anchor Store away, reduces its footprint, provides a parking structure in front of it that can be designed to provide architectural cues and signing [sic] that would provide the readily [sic] visibility needed for the anchor retailer. Thus, a more appropriate amount of visibility is still accommodated for the Anchor retailer. (This overstated solution appearing in the “Proposed Plan” has been further cushioned by additional smaller more appropriate retail buildings in front of the parking structure along Victory Boulevard.)

If you consider that the Anchor Retailer still has visibility, the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community”* actually has more retail that is visible.

In viewing Westfield’s other retail locations, visibility from the perimeter streets, especially at their indoor mall locations, is much less than the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”*. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-109

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-108. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-110

D. “Further, this wrap around parking is intended for uses with lower parking ratios than required for retail facilities.”

Response- There was a lack of understanding of the plan and no inquiries were made to prevent such inaccuracies in the evaluation of it. First the following parking ratios were used in the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community”*:

- Retail uses- 4 spaces per 1000 sf of use
- Restaurant uses- 1 space per 100 sf of use
- Office- 2 spaces per 1000 sf of use (This is the minimum requirement of the LA Municipal Code. The Warner Center Specific Plan has an upper limit of 4 per 1000.)
- Some assumptions were made regarding the proposed Community Center as the uses included haven’t been discussed and the building has a potential of either being a one story 15,000sf or a two story 30,000sf [sic] structure. These decisions could affect the required parking.
- Available Enterprise Zone ratios were deemed inappropriate and are not included in the concepts of this plan.

The amount of parking provided in this plan amounted to a total of 3,466 spaces. More stringent criteria was used in counting the surface parking than was used in the *“Proposed Plan”*. [sic] Trees were assumed to be provided for every four parking spaces as is the more conservative interpretation of the WC specific plan requirements. If planting were to

occur as shown on the “*Proposed Plan*” an increase in parking of a little more than 25 spaces would occur in the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*”. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 25-110

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-108.

Comment No. 25-111

E. “Based on the size of the parking structures proposed and the amount of parking required, each of the parking structures would be 10 stories high;.....”

Response- It seems evident that the evaluations contained in this DEIR did not take into account that above the retail level, each of the ‘wrapped’ parking structures includes another bay of parking at each level. The parking structures have the same amount of stories, 6 stories, as the centralized parking structure in the ‘ [sic] Proposed Plan”. [sic] Actual overall heights of the structures in the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*” were thought to actually be lower than what is being proposed in the “Proposed Plan” as the floor to floor heights in the applicant’s proposed structures, as presented to the community, seemed excessive and would make the structures too tall. In the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community*” the floor to floor heights were to be reduced.

Response to Comment No. 25-111

Please refer to the analysis provided in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for information regarding the problems generated by multiple, smaller-sized parking structures for vehicular circulation and pedestrian-vehicular interaction.

Comment No. 25-112

F. “...additionally, the access point for these parking structures would be located on Westfield way [sic] and would not be completely adequate to serve the parking structure. Any queuing caused by accessing the parking structures could adversely affect the circulation on Westfield Way.”

Response- This comment has merit and because of the decentralized layout of the parking structures, alternate access points to the structures, if desired from the other streets, can be accommodated to mitigate this issue. The “Proposed Project” reflects a centralized

parking structure. The circulation within this type of large parking structure with multiple access points tends to be confusing , [sic] complicated and a turn off to customers and tends to promote the over reliance of the surface parking areas. The decentralized parking, once entered, is clearer in its circulation and promotes the customer coming back and not relying on the surface parking available.

Response to Comment No. 25-112

Multiple smaller garages will likely lead to a greater number of conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, as people will be forced to drive between garages to find available parking spaces. In addition, shoppers at the anchor retailer are anticipated to primarily use the surface parking area south of the anchor retailer, and possibly the first floor of the centralized parking structure. The remainder of the shops, restaurants, office, and hotel would be served by the centralized parking structure, as well as the surface parking along Topanga Canyon Boulevard, which would be located closer and, thus, be more convenient to these uses. Access to all on-site parking will be clearly marked from all entrances with the appropriate wayfinding signage. The parking structure design combined with the appropriate wayfinding signage will make the parking structure easy and convenient for visitors to use.

Comment No. 25-113

G. "Given the parking structure footprint shown there would be insufficient parking between the anchor store and the office building."

Response- The Office building has parking within it. The parking garage next to the anchor store is a flat slab/ speed ramp type structure to accommodate shopping carts. It is again six stories and would accommodate about six hundred spaces. Also, the most northerly 'wrapped' parking structure is connected to the Anchor Store over Westfield Way to provide additional direct access parking. The retail/ restaurant uses along Victory Boulevard are provided with parking options from any of the parking in the project. Also, the office building has been located to help 'feed' the retail/ restaurant uses along Victory Boulevard during lunch and after work. Available transit stops are close to this area of the project which would also encourage additional patron [sic] on foot.

Response to Comment No. 25-113

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review.

Comment No. 25-114

H. *“In addition the modified site plan does not show a clear pedestrian orientation or clear pathway into and throughout the site.”*

Response- The primary circulation system for vehicles and pedestrians is a grid system which is the most familiar and recognizable, and thus most clear organization, mostly because it the layout that occurs in most cities in the United States.

Two pedestrian only passages occur as well.

The main one is exactly the same as the *“Proposed Plan”* which was thought to be a very strong concept The use of this suburban outdoor mall concept in combination of the urban village regional center theories used for the rest of the site creates the best thoughts of both ideas for an area that has been argued to be in transition from a suburban to urban regional center.

Another pedestrian only path was provided adjacent to the retail/ commercial/ restaurants along Victory Boulevard. This one provides a more pleasing connection to the transit stop on Owensmouth. This path also helps guarantee the success of retail along Victory Boulevard.

In the *“Proposed Plan”* the pedestrian is forced to transverse a large surface parking lot.

Response to Comment No. 25-114

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-115

8. Page 1036- *“The “Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community”, which locates a new high rise building within the northeast comer [sic] of the site in closer proximity to residential uses, would not implement the Community Plan’s applicable design policies to protect the quality of residential development, and to consider neighborhood character to the same extent as the project.”*

Response- If we have a Community Plan that would support a 20 pump gas station instead of an iconic piece of architecture through the use of a high rise building in an important Regional Center, then as stated by many, some updating of the Community Plan is desperately needed. It is doubtful that the intent of that plan is to support such a choice.

The “Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community’ [sic] is an example of what can be done at this corner. The following are some appropriate possibilities:

- A. The Office Building as proposed is in keeping with the other office high rises all the way along that side of Owensmouth.
- B. A smaller Office Building at that corner would work as well. The rest of the office square footage proposed could be located over the southern most [sic] ‘wrapped’ parking structure.
- C. The office building could remain in the location on the ‘Proposed Plan’ and a smaller scaled, mixed used gateway project could be located at the corner of Owensmouth and Victory. This project could serve as the celebratory pedestrian north east entrance to the entire project and provide the connection to the transit stop.
- D. Other options that could be supported by the Applicant’s business interests but would also meet the intent of the City’s planning documents and the interests of the Community.

The option for a fueling station was not included in the “Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community’ [sic] because there are 15 gas stations within 1.5 miles of this location, 8 gas stations within .75 miles [sic] and one of the gas stations is about .25 miles [sic] away at the corner of Victory and Topanga. There is currently an empty gas station that would need revitalization at the corner of Winnetka and Ventura Boulevards.

Using the Los Angeles Department of City Planning’s Draft Core Findings No. 1, *“That the project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or will provide a service that is essential to the community, city or region.”*, [sic] the fueling station was thought to not meet this criteria. (The member only characteristic was considered in this decision and the performing of a function portion of the finding is what was thought to be relevant.)

The Owensmouth Parkway as reflected in the Warner Center Specific Plan is defined as *“The area along Owensmouth Avenue between Vanowen Street on the north and the Ventura Freeway on the south.”* Some of the noted objectives in the Specific Plan for this parkway are, *“Establish a street that encourages pedestrian use by promoting pedestrian serving activities.”* [sic] and *“Coordinate the design of Owensmouth Avenue so that the existing and future transportation requirements are addressed in a creative, functional and aesthetically pleasing manner.”* The Specific Plan goes on to state *“activities and spaces.....should be street oriented rather than internally focused within a development.”* The fueling station was deemed to not meet the intent of the Owensmouth Parkway. The

walls, berms, and landscaping proposed to hide the fueling station included in the “Proposed Plan” illustrates its lack of street orientation. The Los Angeles Department of City Planning Draft Commercial Design Guidelines states under Objective 4, “Reserve corner locations for buildings.” Again, [sic] the fueling station did not meet criteria where it could be considered a building in the best terms of the definition and , [sic] once again, it seemed inappropriate for the “Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community” to reflect a fueling station at that location.

Response to Comment No. 25-115

A fueling station is permitted by-right under the project site’s zoning. As part of the entitlements being requested, the project is asking that the hours of operation be extended for the fueling station. The City of Los Angeles, as the lead agency and decision maker, will consider this request as part of the public hearing process. The environmental impacts of the fueling station are evaluated in the Draft EIR and determined to have less than significant impacts. For more information regarding the environmental analysis associated with the fueling station, please refer to Topical Response No. 4.

The CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project. The Draft EIR analyzed a total of six alternatives, including alternatives with a variety of sizes and locations for the office use. In addition, the Applicant has determined that the individual location of the proposed buildings is optimal and provides for the most efficient development of the density and mix of uses.

Regarding the fueling station, please refer to Topical Response No. 6, which determined that there would be sufficient market demand within Warner Center to support the member-only fueling station.

As discussed in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project site is located within the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan, which implements the land use policy standards of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework. The project site is also subject to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, which governs land use through building design standards and development restrictions. In addition, the project site is located within the adopted Warner Center Specific Plan area. Consistency with these plans and associated regulatory documents/requirements is provided in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. In addition, applicable urban design policies within the General Plan Framework, Community Plan, and Specific Plan, including consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway Guidelines, are addressed in detail in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of this Draft EIR.

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-5 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the objectives of the Draft Citywide Commercial Design Guidelines.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-116

9. **Page 1036-** *"In addition, the building heights within the central portion of the site would be increased when compared with the project. Thus the site plan is less visually compatible with surrounding land uses when compared with the project."*

Overall, aesthetic impacts under the modified site plan alternative proposed in the community would be less than significant, but would be greater when compared with the project."

Response- As previously responded, the evaluation is based on ten story parking structures in the "Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community" which is incorrect. Eliminating the fueling station, breaking up the parking structure into smaller scaled structures, eliminating the large surface parking lot and moving the big box Anchor Retailer away from Victory are all improvements to the visual compatibility compared with the "Proposed Project". [sic] Options for the Office Building previously discussed could be evaluated in that regard as well.

Response to Comment No. 25-116

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-117

10. **Page 1036- Views-** *"In particular the site plan presented by the community would locate a new high rise building within the northeastern portion of the site closer to the existing multifamily uses rather than in the southern portion of the site and would also include taller buildings within the middle of the site."*

Response- The middle of the site would not be taller as previously explained. The office building options have been explained as well.

Response to Comment No. 25-117

The description of the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community was derived from the illustration created within the community, as shown in Figure V-6 in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Please also refer to Response to Comment No. 25-115 regarding the options for the office building.

Comment No. 25-118

11. **Page 1037-** Shading - “shading impacts would be greater than the project.”

Response- The existing office buildings shade the existing residential complexes currently and the office building location in the “*Proposed Project*” could shade the residential users late in the day as it is placed west of the complexes. The Office Building location in the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*” is located to the north of the Residential uses and would not shade these complexes. The location does have the ability to shade Commercial properties across the street at certain times of the day and year. These properties currently have large parking lots. The shading would be an advantage to those uses but admittedly would be minimal. The shading does not really seem to be a major factor in any of these schemes though.

Response to Comment No. 25-118

As described in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light, and Glare, and Shading, the project would not shade currently sensitive uses for more than three hours during the winter; and for more than four hours in the spring, summer, and fall. In addition, as discussed in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community is also not anticipated to shade sensitive uses for a period in excess of the significance threshold. However, this site plan would locate the proposed office tower at the northeast corner of the project site in closer proximity to the multi-family residential uses located to the east of the project site along Owensmouth Avenue, thus resulting in greater shading impacts when compared to the project.

Comment No. 25-119

12. **Page 1039-** “*The site plan would not include development of the member-only fueling station. Therefore, the number of daily, weekend and peak hour trips generated by this site plan would be less than the number of trips generated by the project. As vehicular emissions are dependent on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in less pollutant emissions compared to the project.*”

Response- Given that the “*Proposed Project*” is deemed to have the traffic impacts as “unavoidable”, [sic] it would seem prudent to eliminate the fueling station as a means to show more due diligence for getting closer to a remedy, even if a total remedy is determined to be unachievable.

Response to Comment No. 25-119

As stated in the Draft EIR, while the number of trips generated by the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would be reduced when compared with the project, traffic and regional air quality impacts under this Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-120

13. Page 1040- Greenhouse Gas Emissions- *“with the elimination of the fueling station and the associated reduction in the number of vehicle trips, impacts under the modified site plan presented in the Community would be reduced when compared with that of the project.”*

Response- This is another characteristic of the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*” that is positive. Again, considering the “Unavoidable” determination in the DEIR it would seem prudent to eliminate the Fueling Station to show more effort toward a reduction in these affects.

It must be noted that the applicant would pursue LEED Silver for most portions of any concept they were to pursue and recognition must be made to them for that commitment to the environment. It seems contrary to this idea however, to be fueling internal combustion engines at the quantities shown in other parts of the DEIR while pursuing such admirable goals.

Response to Comment No. 25-120

As summarized in Table V-2 on page 917 in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, project impacts related to greenhouse gases would be less than significant and not unavoidable as stated by the Commentor. As such, although elimination of the fueling station would reduce the project’s greenhouse gas emissions, impacts with or without the fueling station would still be less than significant. In addition, the project would implement several project design features to promote the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as on-site secure, covered bicycle storage areas, and preferred parking to low-

emitting (zero emission vehicles) and fuel-efficient vehicles. Also refer to Response to Comment No. 25-119.

Comment No. 25-121

14. **Page 1044-** “both modified site plans consist of a design that would place the anchor retailer internal to the site resulting in greater pedestrian/vehicular conflicts from cars traveling internal to the site.”

Response- With regard to both alternate plans, pedestrian/ vehicular conflicts would be reduced as the parking for the anchor retailer has been moved closer to the exterior of the site and is located directly adjacent to the functions it is serving. These vehicles do not need to transverse a large amount of the site to find parking. In the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*” all the parking for the Anchor Retailer is located in parking structures and is closer. The pedestrian is not required to cross as many drive aisles of surface or garage parking in the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community*” to travel from vehicle to the anchor retailer.

Response to Comment No. 25-121

The decentralized parking layout analyzed would likely lead to unnecessary circulation within both the parking structures and the project site, which would cause additional opportunities for pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. As a parking structure fills, users will circulate searching for available spaces within the structure; if none are found, the user must exit one parking structure and enter another, and search the next structure in the same way. Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for additional information regarding the project’s parking.

There are no problems associated with providing the majority of the project parking in a centralized parking structure provided that the structure is well designed, has adequate floor-to-floor capacity, and is well connected to the adjacent street system. All three are the case for the proposed centralized structure. In a single large structure, drivers are able to search for and access spaces that are close to their destinations. Also, circulation is contained within the larger structure, as opposed to excessive circulation with the smaller multiple structures.

Comment No. 25-122

15. **Page 1044-** “*The Modified Site Plans Alternative would meet the majority of the Walkability Checklist, but to a lesser degree than the project.*”

Comment- The following item of the Walkability Checklist would be greatly improved with the design reflected in the Alternate F- *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community.”*

A. *“The purpose of the Guidance for Site Plan Reviewworking with developers to make developments more walkable, that is to enhance pedestrian activity, access, comfort and safety” [sic]*

B. *“The primary entrance for pedestrians should be at grade level from the public way and be easily accessible from transit stops with as direct a path as possible to the transit stop. Retail establishments should maintain at least one entrance from the public way with doors unlocked during business hours.”*

C. *“...mid-block passageways or paseos should be active, visually interesting spaces and safe.”*

D. *“Enhance pedestrian comfort and safety by providing views into buildings and beyond the street wall.”*

E. *“At corners, the building frontage should consider building cutoffs in response to any need to accommodate pedestrians and to protect pedestrian safety, security and enjoyment.”*

F. *“In non-residential uses, most (i.e. [sic] 75%) of the ground floor building façade should be devoted to pedestrian entrances, pedestrian-level display windows and/or pedestrian-level windows affording views into and out of the building interior.”*

G. *“When pedestrians have to determine their own path through driveways and parking lots, confusion and conflicts between pedestrians and motorists will result.”*

H. *“Prevent auto-pedestrian conflicts” [sic]*

I. *“Where incorporated, mid-block passageways or paseos should be active, visually interesting, and safe places, and include features such as furniture, various textures, various architectural features, public art, information kiosks displays, pedestrian level lighting.”*

Alternative F *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”* is consistently designed fulfilling these requirements over the entire site. The proposed project does not meet these requirements in at least half the site. Activated streets occur more often and connections to the transit on Owensmouth is provided in Alternative F.

Alternative F also better meets the requirements of the Owensmouth Parkway, the Existing Specific Plan, the Proposed Draft Specific Plan, and the Draft City of Los Angeles Planning Department's Commercial Design Guidelines. It also meets all the Planning Principals proposed to the applicant by the Planning, Land Use and Mobility Committee of the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council. These principals are not met in the Proposed Project and have not been recognized in this DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 25-122

As discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, the project would be consistent with the majority of the principles set forth in the City's Walkability Checklist, and the Specific Plan including, the Owensmouth Parkway design guidelines. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-5 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the objectives of the Draft Citywide Commercial Design Guidelines. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-123

16. Page 1044- *".....particularly the site plan proposed by the community would likely be inadequate to attract tenants requiring high visibility that are needed for the success of the project, this alternative would not achieve SCAG's goals to provide new jobs and to enhance economic vitality to the extent the project would."*

Response- Visibility for the anchor tenant would still be possible and the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"* actually increases, not decreases the amount of visible retail linear footage included as previously stated in the Item 4.C above. Again, the method of providing visibility for the anchor tenant (Locating a windowless wall over 400 feet long up against Victory Boulevard)as [sic] reflected in the "Proposed Plan" is an overstated solution to the requirement for visibility. If the tenant's stated needs can't be handled in another manner, than the City should be questioning the effort of the applicant's/ tenant's openness to solutions related to reasonable visibility.

The current proposed anchor tenant has a location in Agoura Hills/ Westlake that is completely hidden from the street with much less visibility than that which is possible in the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community"*. [sic] Surveys by the Community noted this location to be crowded and the conclusion was that it is successful.

The amount of actual new jobs being generated by the anchor tenant (besides temporary construction jobs), is a question that really isn't directly related to the discussions of the alternate plans and will be covered elsewhere in the DEIR public comments.

Response to Comment No. 25-123

Visibility from public streets is critical to the success of retailers, including the anchor retailer. The Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would not specifically increase the visibility of the anchor retail tenant. Under this site plan, the anchor retailer building would be located internal to the site rather than immediately fronting the arterial roads that bound the project site. Therefore, the anchor retailer building in the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community is less visible compared to the project.

Per the CEQA Guidelines, “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The alternatives analysis provided in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of each of the alternatives in comparison to the project. This included an analysis of land use compatibility and consistency with relevant regional and local land use plans, policies, and regulations. As stated on page 1044 of the Draft EIR, the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would not be as visible to pedestrians and automobiles on the main roads and would, therefore, be less likely to attract patrons and visitors compared to the project. As a result, this site plan is likely to be less economically successful, thereby generating less revenue and creating fewer full-time and part-time employment opportunities. Therefore, the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would be less compatible with SCAG’s employment projections and goals to provide new jobs and to enhance economic vitality.

Comment No. 25-124

17. **Page 1044-** *“Overall, impacts relative to consistency with the land use plans, policies, and regulations would be greater when compared with the project and such impacts would be less than significant.”*

Response- This overall summary statement is incorrect when related to the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”. [sic] To respond in the appropriate detail, however reference back to all the previous responses for ‘Section V. Alternatives, F. Alternative F-Modified Site Plans’ is the most adequate method to cover the information.

Response to Comment No. 25-124

The description of the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community was derived from the illustration created within the community, as shown in Figure V-6 in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-125

18. **Page 1045- Noise-** “However, neither site plan proposes additional areas for development or different land uses, with the exception of the elimination of the fueling station under the site plan proposed by the community. Therefore these modified site plans will be similar in impacts.” [sic] and, “In addition daily trips under the modified site plan presented in the community would be reduced, resulting in a reduction in traffic noise.”

Response- Because of the amount of fueling stations that already exist in the community and the scale of what is included in the “Proposed Plan”, [sic] the amount of fuel trucks, and the amount of passenger vehicles entering and exiting and queuing up seems to dictate a reconsideration of this function being included in the plan. The “Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community” reflects deletion of this function for these reasons and the many reasons reflected in the other responses.

Response to Comment No. 25-125

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 regarding access and queuing associated with the fueling station. Also refer to Topical Response No. 6 regarding the number of fueling stations in the community.

Comment No. 25-126

19. **Page 1046- 2. Police-** “The Modified Site Plans Alternative would result in a similar demand for police protection services relative to the non-residential daytime populations on the project site would be similar to that of the project.”

Response- The “Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community” provides more activated paths and thus more defensible space than the “*Proposed Plan*”. [sic] When retail/ office/ commercial uses line more of the streets, more activity occurs on the streets. When streets are more activated, they are inherently safer in their design, requiring less reliance on electronic monitoring or police presence. Many police department reviews and conditions of approval take defensible space design into account and encourage its practices through their comments. It’s surprising that this characteristic of the “*Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community*” is not noted here.

The reference to daytime population should be expanded for the “*Proposed Plan*” and all the Alternates, as the project has been presented to the community as an area that would be functioning after dark.

Response to Comment No. 25-126

As described in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, under the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community, the locations of the publicly accessible open-space areas would be modified and would not be as centralized when compared with the project. In addition, based on the modified layout of the buildings and the decentralization of parking, the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would not provide a clear pedestrian orientation or clear pedestrian pathway into and throughout the site when compared to the project, thus creating a less secure pedestrian route. In addition, given that the Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community would provide decentralized parking and would also separate retail/restaurant uses across the project site, the parking facilities and the project site would be more difficult to patrol and would be less accessible by safety personnel. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

The police service population of the project was determined based on police service population conversion factors contained in the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide (2006), Section K.1, Police Protection. These conversion factors generally correlate to the size and type of use proposed. For the project, based on the square footage and uses proposed, a police service population of approximately 3,201 persons per day would be generated. Actual population will fluctuate depending on time of year (e.g., tourist season).

Comment No. 25-127

20. **Page 1051-** *“Each of these structures is estimated to accommodate 800 spaces on ten levels”* [sic]

Response- A reconsideration of the conclusions is required based on the following-

A. The most northerly and the most southerly wrapped parking structures contain approximately 830 spaces in six stories.

B. The structure in the middle contains approximately 630 spaces in six stories. This additional information should affect many conclusions throughout this DEIR including the statements made in the rest of the paragraph immediately following this quote. Please consider the extra bay per floor and the ability to adjust access point locations in the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed by the Community”*. [sic]

Also consideration must be made to the issue that some of the retail customers have an aversion to centralized parking because of its size, the amount of decisions required within

the structure and its multiple access points. The centralized parking concept creates conflicts between the anchor store customer and the others who want to use the neighboring proposed restaurants and retail. The anchor store customers that will be leaving large shopping carts in parking spaces and dominating the lower floors of parking will discourage the other customer's [sic] from continuing to use the project.

Response to Comment No. 25-127

The decentralized parking layout analyzed would likely lead to additional circulation within both the parking structures and the project the site, which would cause increased opportunities for pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. As a parking structure fills, users will circulate searching for available spaces within the structure; if none are found, the user must exit one parking structure and enter another, and search the next structure in the same way. Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for additional information regarding the project's parking.

Providing the majority of the project parking in a centralized parking structure is efficient provided that the structure is well designed, has adequate floor-to-floor capacity, and is well connected to the adjacent street system. All three are the case for the proposed centralized structure and therefore no significant impacts would occur. In a single large structure, drivers are able to search for and access spaces that are close to their destinations. Also, circulation is contained within the larger structure, as opposed to excessive circulation with the smaller multiple structures.

Comment No. 25-128

21. **Page 1052-** *"As indicated on this proposed modified plan (proposed in the community), the total number of access points is five driveways; when compared to the project, this is a reduction from eight proposed driveways."*

Response- Two of the deleted access points, it was thought, would be dominated by fueling station operations, deleted in this scheme, with only slight sharing of anchor retailer loading and customer use. One of these two access points, located along Victory Boulevard, was specifically not considered as viable during the planning of the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"* as controversy/ concern existed in the community as to the probability that this access point would interfere with the queuing at the intersection of Owensmouth and Victory.

Concerns were verified, on site, at the intersection of Victory and Topanga and it was noted that the access point shown on the *"Proposed Plan"* on Victory that was not shown on the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"*, [sic] was located too close to the

intersection and would empty vehicles mid-queue on Victory at selected times of the day even in off-holiday times of the year. The community members involved with this work would welcome input from the Department of Transportation regarding this access point as it can be easily be [sic] included in this or other plans if the perceived issue is not a concern. It is believed that this access point has issues, but if it is not deleted, it would have to be a right turn in/ right turn out setup.

Overall, the consideration of the reduced quantities of driveways made sense considering the elimination of the fuel station and the possible conflicts with the intersections indicated.

Response to Comment No. 25-128

The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Appendix H-3 of the Draft EIR) indicates that all nine driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project with the fueling station. Reducing the total number of site access points would concentrate project traffic into fewer driveways. Specifically, as the number of project driveways is decreased and traffic is concentrated at the entry points, this level of operation is not anticipated to be maintained.

Comment No. 25-129

22. **Page 1052-** *“This may also affect the intersections immediately adjacent to the project site”* [sic]

Response- It was thought that the removal of the three access points included in the “Proposed Plan” would prevent the negative effects of placing access points close to existing intersections.

Response to Comment No. 25-129

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-128. The Owensmouth Avenue driveway to the fueling station is located approximately 325 feet from the intersection of Victory Boulevard; the Victory Boulevard driveway from the fueling station is located approximately 220 feet from the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue. Based on LADOT policies, these driveways are located sufficiently distant from the adjacent intersection and are not anticipated to present conflicts.

Comment No. 25-130

23. **Page 1052-** *“The decentralization of the site parking would reduce the efficiencies of and opportunities for shared parking.”*

Response- The northern wrapped parking structure can be shared parking for the anchor retailer via the proposed bridge. The northern parking structure can also be used for the Community Center. The southern wrapped structure can be shared with the hotel. All wrapped parking structures can be used for all retail spaces throughout the site. The office parking can be shared with the adjacent retail at night and on weekends.

Response to Comment No. 25-130

A large centralized parking supply is more conducive to shared parking when compared to the same sized parking supply spread among several parking structures. As the parking would be shared, the centralized location allows users to conveniently park their vehicles as close to their destinations as necessary. The decentralized concept requires the user to park across the site and reduces the convenience of the park once concept.

Comment No. 25-131

24. **Page 1052-** *“Additional wayfinding signage for visitors would be required to access the appropriate parking structures”* [sic]

Response- Both the *“Proposed Plan”* and the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”* will both require wayfinding. The difference between the two plans is that whether wayfinding happens inside a very large centralized parking structure or on the new interior streets. The amount of decisions required inside the centralized parking structure; multiple access points, combining Costco parking with other retailers, maze like layouts and sheer size, will add to the visitor’s disorientation and frustration. The amount of decisions to find parking is actually less and clearer in the decentralized scheme. When decisions are made outside on the street, there are more Visual cues to orient the visitor. The inside of a parking structure has a sameness the [sic] also adds to the confusion of being able to locate oneself. As the parking structure gets larger, this problem increases.

Response to Comment No. 25-131

A single, centralized garage will provide more convenience for the customer and fewer vehicle-pedestrian conflicts, as drivers will be able to access parking spaces more quickly and efficiently. Access to all on-site parking will be clearly marked from all entrances with the appropriate wayfinding signage. The parking structure design, combined with the appropriate wayfinding signage, will make the parking structure easy and convenient for visitors to use. In addition, many large retail and entertainment centers, such as Disneyland, utilize a single, large parking structure.

Comment No. 25-132

25. **Page 1054-** *“However, it is critical that anchor retailers be located in high visibility locations in order to attract visitors to the project site, drawing people in to visit other smaller retail shops, dine in adjacent restaurants, or see a movie.”*

Response- Please refer back to the response on page 1034, Item C. Pushing the anchor retailer up against Victory Boulevard is an exaggerated solution to this issue. The *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”*, [sic] provides ample visibility. Also, the proposed anchor retailer has a location in Westlake that has no visibility on the street and is always very crowded. This is an example of the applicant’s attitude toward the community’s input and unwillingness to incorporate other ideas into their plan. Also, Westfield themselves have an example of a similar format to the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”*. [sic] The Target at the Topanga Mall is set back from the street, is two stories and has parking wrapped around it.

26. **Page 1055-** *“...is to maximize the visibility of retail tenants through a project design that locates retail tenants in areas easily available from public streets.....the anchor retailer internal to the site.....”*

Response- Once again refer to the response to page 1034, Item C and the response to page 1054.

Response to Comment No. 25-132

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-123 for a discussion of the anchor retailer’s visibility. The Target at Westfield Topanga includes surface parking between the store and Owensmouth Avenue, in addition to direct access from the parking structure.

Comment No. 25-133

27. **Page 1055-** *“.....wrap-around parking areas presents a layout that is more appropriate for residential design and would not function well for retail uses”* [sic]

Response- Refer to the response to page 1034, Item A.

Response to Comment No. 25-133

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-107.

Comment No. 25-134

28. **Page 1055-** *“...retail locations would not be readily identifiable and visible to passers by [sic] as retail would be more concentrated internal to the site due to wrap-around parking.”*

Response- Refer to the response to page 1034, Item C and the response to page 1054.

Response to Comment No. 25-134

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 25-109 and 25-132.

Comment No. 25-135

29. **Page 1055-** *“...based on the sizes and configurations of the new retail spaces.....most of the retail space would not be leasable as the site plan does not provide enough flexibility...”*

Response- A two story scheme for the anchor store provides enough options for tenants (See Page 1055 response below). The other retail provides a variety of location [sic] and sizes, large box layout similar to the “Proposed Plan”, [sic] corner/intersection locations and retail spaces lined along pedestrian ways with depths up to 70’ deep. With closer scrutiny and detailed design of the wrap-around retail parking structure buildings, more depth can be accomplished as it has been achieved in other locations to accommodate such uses as premium grocers.

Response to Comment No. 25-135

The retail depths described above are not feasible, except in very unique instances. Typical retail depths for anchor stores similar to the anchor proposed for the project site are between 100 feet and 120 feet. Retail depths less than 100 feet are generally not feasible since it prevents the store from carrying sufficient inventory. Please refer to the analysis provided in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for information regarding the problems generated by the Modified Site Plans Alternative.

Comment No. 25-136

30. **Page 1055-** *“Many large format retailers do not successfully operate on multiple levels thus making it difficult to attract a tenant for this site design.”*

Response- The large footprint caused by a one story large format retailer causes large expanses of inactivated walls and is too large in scale to be located so close to the street. In fact the wall, 25' from the property line, would be one and half football fields in length. The large format retailer is more appropriate in an industrial area instead of the West Valley's downtown.

Although there are many retailers with one floor and large parking lots adjacent to the site, there are none of this size so close to the street and there are many examples of 2 story anchors. Target, [sic] Bed Bath and [sic] Beyond are two comparable retailers that are housed in two story formats. In fact, Target has adjacent and attached multistory parking, similar to the *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"*, [sic] and this is located within a Westfield Shopping establishment across the street.

Other retailers that are examples of multi- story [sic] formats nearby are Macy's, Nordstrom, and Sears. Sears seems the fairest and most comparable example as large appliances and heavy items are sold in their store and not located at the main level.

Another large format retailer that functions in a multi-story format is IKEA. Although there are many examples, the closest one is in Burbank. Once again the IKEA parking is a multi-story parking arrangement.

The community found multi-story Costco establishments in other parts of the country. Although the examples, for the most part were located in highly dense urban areas or where multi-story was mandated by local jurisdictional regulation, they do exist. One noted multi-story example, located in a suburban setting, was a location in Port Chester, NY.

The positive aspects of the multi-story scheme and the options for site design that it opens up, makes this a more appropriate format. The specific anchor retailer has stated that a multistory scheme has not been as successful as one story schemes in the past. The *"Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community"*, [sic] is meant to show how the positives of this format should encourage a stronger consideration for a multistory scheme.

Response to Comment No. 25-136

As described by the Commentor, the multi-story format for the anchor retailer functions primarily in very densely built, urban locations, or where a single-story format is prohibited. Many large format retailers do not successfully operate on multiple levels, making it difficult to attract a tenant for this site design. An alternative project site plan with a two-story anchor retailer was analyzed as part of Alternative F, Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. This alternative project site plan was determined to have greater impacts with regard to Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Light, Shading, Land Use Consistency, Parking, and

Access. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the anchor retailer's Victory Boulevard design.

Comment No. 25-137

31. **Page 1055-** *".....Objective 5....would not be obtained."*

Response- The large floor plate single level retailer, based on the "Proposed Plan", [sic] is detrimental to the community and too stringent and specific of an objective for the project. The "Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community", [sic] does not meet this description, but does meet all other elements of this objective just as much as the "Proposed Plan". [sic]

The amount of jobs/ taxes generated, considering the closing of the Anchor retailer's location in Canoga Park, will be covered in other responses to this DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 25-137

Section 15124(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the Project Description shall contain "a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project." As set forth by the CEQA Guidelines, the list of objectives that the Applicant seeks to achieve for the project is provided in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 25-138

32. **Page 1056-** *"Objective 6 is to provide readily accessible and easily identifiable centrally located retail and parking facilities with shared parking....."*

Response- Refer to the response to page 1034, Item C and the responses to page 1052 and 1054.

Response to Comment No. 25-138

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 25-109, 25-128, 25-129, 25-130, 25-131, and 25-132.

Comment No. 25-139

33. Page 1056- *“The floor plate proposed for the anchor retailer is not sufficient to attract anchor retailers.”*

Response- Refer to the response to page 1055, “Many large format retailers....”

Response to Comment No. 25-139

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-136.

Comment No. 25-140

34. Page 1056- *“.....parking structures would be 10 stories high.”*

Response- Refer to the response to page 1035, Item E.

Response to Comment No. 25-140

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-111.

Comment No. 25-141

35. Page 1056- *“.....the access points of these structures under the modified site plan proposed in the community are located along Westfield Way.....”*

Response- Refer to the response to page 1034, Item F.

Response to Comment No. 25-141

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-112.

Comment No. 25-142

36. Page 1056- *“.....Objective 7.....”*

Response- A two-story scheme should not be the reason for not meeting this objective. Refer to the response to Page 1055- *“Many large format retailers...”*

Response to Comment No. 25-142

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-136.

Comment No. 25-143

37. **Page 1057-** “.....Objective 9.....” and “.....Objective 10.....”

Response- The bottom line is that that the most possible anchor retailer has said they will walk if the space provided to them isn't one story and exactly how proposed. This would cause the applicant, the city and the community to have to wait to achieve these objectives in a more appropriate way in the future or find another tenant if any adjustments are made that are reflected on the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community.”* [sic] First, refer to the response to Page 1055- *“Many large format retailers...”* that shows that there is more than one solution to solving the anchor tenant issue. Then realize what is being stated is that there are no options besides the one being presented by this specific anchor retailer. The city is caught in a desperate predicament of being broke. Immediate gratification, money, could determine that the wishes of city planners, and outspoken community activists about missed opportunities will be ignored unless these responses are more carefully considered (or reconsidered in some cases).

The last paragraph contains generalities that the specific responses to the Alternate Plans address. The *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”* would provide a destination for residents of the west valley and beyond that would be as successful and comparable to areas in Pasadena, the entire downtown of Santa Monica and Burbank, walking district of Manhattan Beach, and many other areas locally and around the country. All these locations include the characteristics shown in the *“Modified Site Plan Proposed in the Community”*. [sic] Do we create an outdoor mall or a vibrant urban district? While considering ‘Project’ objectives one needs to ask ‘What are the OBJECTIVES of the city and the community?’

Response to Comment No. 25-143

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 26

Dennis T. DiBiase
20525 Aetna St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
denkardib@msn.com

Comment No. 26-1

Please see the attached mark up of the concept plan relating to the Draft Environmental Impact report for the Village at Westfield Topanga project (ENV-2007-3393-EIR).

Please consider this an addendum to the previous personal comments for my submittals during the public comment period.

Thank you for your consideration of these responses.

Response to Comment No. 26-1

The current location of the fueling station pumps allows for the maximum number of cars to be accommodated on-site, avoiding queuing onto Owensmouth Avenue. The suggestion to move the fuel station pumps farther east would result in loss of stack space for car queuing. Regarding the suggestion to add another tower to the anchor store Victory Boulevard elevation, please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the anchor retail building's design elements, articulation, and vertical breaks which are intended to minimize horizontality. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-34 for more information regarding the community center. A courtyard facing Topanga Canyon Boulevard would duplicate the internal gathering space proposed by the project and would be located in a less pedestrian-friendly location than the project's proposed internal pedestrian-oriented, open-space areas. With the parking structure engaging the retail buildings in the revised site plan referenced in Topical Response No. 5, the building cut-offs are not proposed. The first floor of the parking structure is now activated through the new connection to retail. As described in more detail in Topical Response No. 5, the articulation of the parking structure will break up the scale of this structure and make it visually interesting. Relocating the transit stop on Owensmouth Avenue is at the discretion of MTA, but it will make it more difficult for riders trying to make transfers to other bus lines to and from Victory Boulevard.

Comment Letter No. 27

Karen L. Wormald DiBiase
20525 Aetna St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
dibiase@tamrac.com

Comment No. 27-1

Page 6 (Overview of the Proposed Project and Project Characteristics)-

Westfield LLC states that the project is to “provide for an anchor retailer integrated with small life style retailers, a hotel and other mixed uses which would **complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center**. The Village would create a mixed-use lifestyle development consisting of a mix of shipping [sic], business, tourism and entertainment uses, along with landscaped areas and recreational and business amenities. The two Village anchors consist of Costco, encompassing 37% of the approx 444,744sf of space for Phase I and a hotel, which is not included until Phase II and may/may not even be built. If this Village project is consistent with the **Regional Shopping Center designation**, then the anchor stores are there to bring in customers that will shop at the rest of the mall. Costco admitted in a Community Forum held last year in the MPR room of Woodland Hills Academy that they are a “destination” end-use store and that customers typically do not continue shopping after completing their purchases at a Costco. Westfield representatives also confirmed that “this is a problem”. [sic] How does a Costco become a “mixed-use lifestyle” retailer? Costco is a members-only retailer and is not open to the public unless they pay to become members.

Response to Comment No. 27-1

This comment providing background of the Commentor and the Commentor’s participation in meetings held for the project is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-2

Page 6 (Overview of the Proposed Project and Project Characteristics)-

Westfield LLC states that the project is to “provide for an anchor retailer integrated with small life style retailers, a hotel and other mixed uses which would **complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center**. The Village would create a mixed-use lifestyle development consisting of a mix of shipping [sic], business, tourism and entertainment

uses, along with landscaped areas and recreational and business amenities. The two Village anchors consist of Costco, encompassing 37% of the approx 444,744sf of space for Phase I and a hotel, which is not included until Phase II and may/may not even be built. If this Village project is consistent with the **Regional Shopping Center designation**, then the anchor stores are there to bring in customers that will shop at the rest of the mall. Costco admitted in a Community Forum held last year in the MPR room of Woodland Hills Academy that they are a “destination” end-use store and that customers typically do not continue shopping after completing their purchases at a Costco. Westfield representatives also confirmed that “this is a problem”. [sic] How does a Costco become a “mixed-use lifestyle” retailer? Costco is a members-only retailer and is not open to the public unless they pay to become members.

Response to Comment No. 27-2

An anchor retailer is a critical component of all of the Applicant’s developments and is a traditional part of most shopping centers. Anchor retail stores, which can be department stores or a major retail chain, are used to provide the primary draw for people to visit a shopping center. People have the opportunity to combine this visit with visiting other smaller retail shops, dining at adjacent restaurants, or watching a movie. The project Applicant designed the project to provide for an anchor retailer, which would complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center and support smaller lifestyle retailers, a hotel and other mixed uses.

The Applicant has identified one potential anchor in Costco as a feasible contributor to the mix of uses anchoring the project. Costco has entered into an agreement for participation in this project. The Costco anchor retailer would raise the visibility of the project in the community and provide the initial encouragement for people to visit. Individually, the project’s smaller shopping center retail shops are unlikely to attract the same number of visitors to the project site as a large anchor retailer.

Comment No. 27-3

Page 8 (Phase I)-

“Retail uses would be linked to the other uses within the project site via landscaped pedestrian walkways”. [sic] There is a bus line stop is on the corner of Owensmouth and Victory. To connect the retails uses, this “link” forces the customer to walk thru the gas station, past the possible auto sales area, the tire installation center, in front of the Costco loading docks and storage areas for their empty boxes and garbage, through the open parking area around Costco and around or through the proposed 100ft high parking structure in order to reach the other portion of the Village retail/restaurants that face

Topanga Canyon. I do not understand how the DEIR can considered this to be “pedestrian orientated”. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 27-3

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project’s pedestrian connections, including from Owensmouth Avenue. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for a discussion of the project’s measures to avoid pedestrian-vehicular conflicts.

Comment No. 27-4

The anchor retailer (Costco) also wants to include a member-only fueling station and tire installation center. The DEIR states that deliveries would “generally occur during the daytime hours. However, there will be 7-12 large delivery trucks making deliveries between 1am and 10am and 3 daily fuel tanker truck deliveries between 6am and 9:30pm. These trucks will directly cross through the “pedestrian walkways” and will need use Owensmouth and Erwin...both currently surrounded with residential housing. There are two office towers on the south West corner of the site that generate office traffic between 7am-7pm (as stated on Page 7 and page 10 of the Executive Summary) that currently exit onto Owensmouth.

Response to Comment No. 27-4

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-13.

Comment No. 27-5

Page 9 and 10 (Phase II)-

The design of the shopping area near Topanga Canyon Blvd [sic] and the Phase II portion appear [sic] to encompass a “pedestrian walkway” link within that area of the site. However, Costco in Phase I and the proposed 100ft high parking structure further separate the Village project into two distinct and separate areas.

Response to Comment No. 27-5

As discussed and illustrated in Topical Response No. 5, and illustrated in Figures II-28 and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed as a cohesive, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of compatible uses and pedestrian amenities that would promote pedestrian access throughout and around the project site. The project would also provide landscaped pedestrian paths and publicly accessible landscaped open-space areas that will also serve to unify the project site. Full

buildout of the project's streetscape elements, including construction of the multi-use trails, sidewalks, and pedestrian amenities, such as new benches and shelters, will be provided as part of Phase 1. Also part of Phase 1, an active pedestrian courtyard is proposed adjacent to the anchor retailer which will serve to integrate the anchor retailer with the project's other uses by connecting directly with the Topanga Canyon Boulevard retail and open-space areas while maintaining easy access to the central parking facility.

Comment No. 27-6

I was at the community forum on "Great Streets" for the overall ideas for the future of Warner Center, and the community strongly supported a community/cultural center. Westfield has proposed a 14,250sf center but not until Phase II, which may/may not be built. This was a major attraction to the Village idea and should be moved to Phase I. This overall project is to be located on the last remaining piece of land in the heart of Warner Center. The community comments in 2007 wanted the Village to be a Century City of the Valley and a source of community pride. The current makeup of retail and parking does not support community pride.

Response to Comment No. 27-6

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 7-10 and 18-34 for additional information regarding the community center. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-7

Page 11 (Parking and Site Access)-

Westfield LLC is proposing moving the existing traffic signal on Victory Blvd. closer to Topanga Canyon Blvd [sic] to allow for the size of Costco [sic] 450ft long building. There will be no way to prevent queues from forming a backup on Topanga Canyon Blvd. as they attempt to enter the Village at this new driveway/entrance.

Response to Comment No. 27-7

The project would provide direct access into the parking structure and parking field through the signalized driveway on Topanga Canyon Boulevard. Additionally, a queuing analysis of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Victory Boulevard was reviewed by LADOT. The analysis indicates that the westbound left-turn lanes from Victory Boulevard into the project site on Westfield Way would be able to satisfy the average westbound left-turn queues without disrupting the flow of westbound through traffic. A dedicated right-turn lane

has been proposed along Victory Boulevard at the Westfield Way driveway; minimal right-turn queuing on Victory Boulevard is anticipated with entry into the project.

Comment No. 27-8

The surface parking and the grade plus 1 level structure will include Costco's over-sized shopping cars through out [sic] this parking area. Currently there is a slope in the south-to-north direction on the entire property. Shopping carts will roll northward (toward Victory Blvd) [sic] if the surface parking is not level. To make this area level, will a large retaining wall on the south side of the property be constructed or will the front of the Costco be raised to accommodate this change in height? If surface parking is a graded slope (as it exists today) shopping carts will roll into parked cars. My car currently has a dent in the door from a shopping cart that rolled past the Kinko's store into my vehicle.

Response to Comment No. 27-8

Balancing of the topography will be completed such that the parking field will be sensitive to shopping cart use. Additionally, the surface parking stalls are considerably larger than the standard stall. The anchor retailer's surface stalls are 10 feet wide by 20 feet deep, allowing for freedom of movement with a cart around parked cars. Several cart corrals will also be placed in the parking field and will be staffed by the anchor retailer to capture empty carts and return them to the store entry. A mechanical device would most likely be used to aid staff in retrieving carts. Some retaining walls may be used to ensure level travel, as well as berms and pavement treatments such as curbs and gutters.

Comment No. 27-9

Page 12 (Open Space Area/Landscape Plan)-

Again, how will Costco be integrated with the stores along the Topanga Canyon side of the property in a "pedestrian-orientated central space"? The plan's "central space" consists of the new driveway entrance and 100ft high proposed parking structure.

Response to Comment No. 27-9

As shown in the conceptual site plan provided in Figure II-6 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, a pedestrian-oriented central space would link the anchor retailer and adjacent retailers. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, this open space between the Costco building and the rest of the retail areas has been reorganized to a more usable and accessible plaza. This was accomplished by pulling the central garage away from the anchor retailer building to improve sightlines, by better defining the

hardscape pattern that continues across the entry drive and by reinforcing this with landscaping and lighting.

Comment No. 27-10

“At the entry to the anchor retailer, an active pedestrian courtyard and outdoor food court would create an activity node within the project site” [sic] This area is will have Costco on one side, the 30ft new entrance street on the other and the surface parking on the other side of the site. Costco is a “member only” facility, so the “activity note [sic] would need to have walls to protect the pedestrian from the cars and to enable only “members’ [sic] to be able to use it. Then [sic] “entry courtyard” is not available to the community at large, only to the “member” of Costco.

Response to Comment No. 27-10

The entry courtyard would not include walls and would be available to the public at large. While not the case at all other locations, food and beverage amenities provided by the anchor retailer would be open to the public and do not require membership for patronage.

Comment No. 27-11

On page 13, the project states that a “gateway” element is planned on the corner of Owensmouth Ave. and Victory Blvd. This “gateway” leads to the entrance of the member-only 20 pump gas station and open parking. The retail area and pedestrian-orientated areas are next to Topanga Canyon...on the opposite side of the site. The DEIR also proposes relocating the existing bus stop from this corner. This will reduce access to the nearby retails [sic] area (Best Buy and the Aaron Brothers strip mall). This will cause a safety issue as bus riders will not exit the buses at the crosswalk.

Response to Comment No. 27-11

Two existing bus stops are each located at the corner of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, along the project’s perimeter. The project does not propose relocating either of these stops from their existing locations. Transit riders currently use the crosswalks to access the adjacent retail centers; this would not be different upon completion of the project. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project’s pedestrian connections from this corner into the project site.

Comment No. 27-12

The term “gateway” is inappropriate and incorrect at this location. The moving of the bus stop is solely to facility [sic] the 20 pump gas station proposed by Costco at that corner and will not serve the greater needs of the shopping community. It is the gas station that should be moved or eliminated.

Response to Comment No. 27-12

The bus stop would be moved and would be improved as part of the project. The new location would provide for improved pedestrian access within the project site and vicinity. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-13

On page 14, the “project would provide a minimum 15ft wide landscaped setback area”. [sic] Is this enough space to a screen the gas station area and offer pedestrians a safe area to exit the bus stop on the corner of Owensmouth and Erwin? 15ft is just a wide sidewalk and not necessarily inviting us to the “gateway”. [sic] Perhaps this should be a wider and safer setback area considering the landscape will take up a good portion of this 15ft area.

Response to Comment No. 27-13

The fueling station would be setback 40 feet from Owensmouth Avenue. The project is consistent with all required setbacks. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for information regarding the project’s compliance with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan. Also refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the gateway elements proposed as part of the project.

Comment No. 27-14**Page 16 (Sustainability and Other Project Design Features)-**

The project is being designed to achieve the “Silver Rating” under the LEED Green Building Program, with the exception of Costco which would be at a minimum [sic] achieve LEED certification. The entire project should be at the Silver Rating for LEED. During these times of environmental awareness, Westfield should build to be a leader in progress and improve to the community. Public comments at the “Great Streets” forum strongly suggested that Warner Center be environmental [sic] forward-thinking. We wish to be proactive in protecting the environment. Woodland Hills reports the highest temperatures

(118 degrees in 2009) during the summer months. Costco's gas station and its environmental impact to the existing water table and underground stream contradict the LEED forward-thinking.

Response to Comment No. 27-14

The project would incorporate a number of smart growth principles. The majority of the project would be designed to achieve the standards of the Silver Rating under the USGBC's Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design ("LEED") green building program, or equivalent green building standards. The anchor retailer building would be designed to achieve the standards of LEED Certified, or an equivalent green building standard, at minimum. The project would also be designed to meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Code. LEED standards would be incorporated through measures that would reduce energy and water usage, and thus reduce associated greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, as described in more detail in Section II, Project Description, the project would incorporate an environmentally sustainable design utilizing green building technologies that involve more resource-efficient modes of construction through energy efficiency, water conservation, environmentally preferable building materials, and waste reduction to create a building design that would be environmentally sustainable. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.H, Traffic, specific sustainability features proposed as part of the project would include secure and covered bicycle storage areas for occupants, shower and changing facilities for hotel employees, and the provision of preferred parking to low-emitting ("Zero Emission Vehicles") and fuel-efficient vehicles for the retail and office components of the project.

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a discussion of the fuel station's safety measures and relationship to underground water.

Comment No. 27-15

Page 18 and 19 (Necessary Approvals)-

- Certification of an Environmental Impact Report. The water tables and an underground stream run on the SW corner of the site, directly under the gas station.

Response to Comment No. 27-15

As discussed in Section IV.C, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR and in the updated March 2011 Geotechnical Report, included as Appendix C of the Final EIR, groundwater was encountered at depths ranging between approximately 16 feet and 35 feet below existing grades in the exploratory borings conducted for the project. Based on

the current groundwater levels, there is a possibility that groundwater may be at or near the excavation bottom, and temporary dewatering may be needed to install the proposed underground storage tanks. Dewatering of excavations may be limited to using localized sumps and trenches for nuisance water if the bottom of excavation is above the groundwater level at the time of construction. However, if the groundwater level rises, requiring several feet of drawdown, Mitigation Measure C-3 would be implemented to ensure that impacts related to groundwater would be less than significant.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 4, the project's fueling station will use the latest equipment technology, incorporate a variety of safety features, and be designed in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements. As required by Project Design Feature G.1-17, all underground storage tanks and containment sumps will consist of double-walled fiberglass, which is corrosion-resistant. The fueling station's underground tanks would use one of the most durable joint sealers currently available to seal the concrete control joints and prevent product spills from reaching the soil and groundwater.

All underground storage tanks and piping will also include leak detection systems and automatic shutoffs. If a problem is detected with an underground tank, the tank would be automatically shut down, and an alarm would be sounded. If the product piping system detects a failure of the 0.1-gallon-per-hour test, the line would be automatically shut down, and the alarm would be sounded. The monitoring system will also be designed so that if power is lost to the monitoring console, the fueling station facility is shut down and will not operate. Emergency shutoff switches will also be installed next to the controller enclosure and in locations near the dispensers, as dictated by the Fire Code.

In light of these requirements and variety of safety measures, impacts to soils or groundwater associated with the fueling station to would be less than significant.

As a point of clarification, the "underground stream" referenced is a man-made, concrete lined drainage swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue. No mapped underground stream has been officially identified within the project site.

Comment No. 27-16

- Conditional Use Permit for automotive uses that do not meet the operational an [sic] development standards of LAMC 12.14.A.6 and 12.22.A.28....ie, [sic] the proposed gas station and tire installation center.

Response to Comment No. 27-16

The proposed fueling station, tire installation center, and auto sales are uses permitted by-right in the project site's (WC)C2 zone. The project is requesting a conditional use permit to extend the hours of operation of these uses and to approve the development standards of the tire installation center, which would be located in the interior of the site, more than 300 feet from Owensmouth Avenue, and would not be visible from the public roadway.

Comment No. 27-17

- Regional Water Quality Control Board approval of Notice of Intent for stormwater runoff during project construction. The natural and existing underground stream is planned to be diverted and all water runoff will need to be addressed and diverted likewise.

Response to Comment No. 27-17

The project would obtain all necessary approvals required by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board before commencing construction and operation of the project. Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for more information regarding the groundwater level in the vicinity of the fuel station and the fuel station's safety features that would be employed to prevent contamination of underground water. As a point of clarification, the "natural underground stream" referenced is a manmade, concrete-lined drainage swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue. No mapped underground stream has been officially identified within the project site.

Comment No. 27-18**Page 24 (Summary of Alternatives)-**

Alternate A – No problem. Costco appears to be dictating to Westfield how and where they will be located on the site. They have made it clear that if there are any changes to their plans, they will abandon the project. During these times of economical struggle and uncertainty, Westfield would be better off waiting for the economy to improve before beginning their "Village Improvement Project. [sic] The community seems willing to support the original presentation from "Great Streets" and not the "scaled down" plan. Currently, there are several retail stores in the Westfield Topanga Mall that should be filled first before building additional new retail stores.

Response to Comment No. 27-18

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Please also see Response to Comment No. 27-2.

Comment No. 27-19

Alternate B – No problem

Alternate C – No problem. The Village is already phased into I and II.

Alternate D – No problem. The office is in Phase II. This would enable the site to be more of a “mixed use lifestyle” as claimed on page 6 of the Executive Summary.

Response to Comment No. 27-19

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-20

Alternate E – In a phased building design, it is possible that Phase II would not be built. Westfield has already showed in their modified Phase I presentation that major revision [sic] could take place and be planned without community input and without a new public forum. If Phase II is not build, [sic] some elements (ie, [sic] community center) should be moved into Phase I to better serve the community’s original goal [sic]

Response to Comment No. 27-20

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 regarding the community center. Also refer to Response to Comment No. 17-45 regarding community input.

Comment No. 27-21

Alternate F – Appears to be a good use of the site and allows for more variety of retailers and a much better parking solution. Placing retail at the bottom of several parking structures will help hide the parking yet still provide needed spaces much closer to businesses, with several areas to park in the shade, instead of only one big parking structure. I currently avoid the Westfield Topanga Mall parking structure as it is difficult to negotiate. Alternate F also allows a Costco, but with a modern and urban 2-story design.

Costco's [sic] like that already exist in several cities. The gas station is removed as it only serves "member-only" and not the "community at large" [sic]

Response to Comment No. 27-21

The decentralization of the three parking structures wrapped by retail, the parking structure adjacent to the anchor retailer, and the parking structure connected to the office tower would reduce the efficiencies of and opportunities for shared parking. Therefore, parking would be utilized much less efficiently as compared to the project. In addition, the decentralized parking layout may lead to unnecessary circulation within the site. As a parking structure fills, users will circulate searching for available spaces within the structure; if none are found, the next structure is searched in the same way. Multiple smaller garages will lead to increased conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, as people will be forced to continue driving between garages to find parking. Overall, impacts related to parking and access would be greater when compared to the project.

An alternative project site plan with a two-story anchor retailer was analyzed as part of Alternative F, Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. This alternative project site plan was determined to have greater impacts with regard to Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Light, Shading, Land Use Consistency, Parking, and Access.

Comment No. 27-22

Page 28 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures)-

- Table I-1, B Air Quality during *operation* - The regional emissions that will be "significant and unavoidable" will be avoidable or greatly reduced without the gas station and the 3 daily tanker truck deliveries.

Response to Comment No. 27-22

The fuel station represents a small portion of the overall vehicular emissions in the operational phase for the project. Vehicular emissions are directly proportional to the number of daily vehicular trips and vehicle miles travelled. The fueling station co-located with the anchor retailer would generate 629 daily trips which represents approximately three percent of the project-generated 19,409 daily trips. Removal of the fueling station would not greatly reduce or avoid significant air quality impacts with regard to regional emissions.

Comment No. 27-23

- Table I-1, H Traffic, Access, and Parking during *Operation* - The 7-12 large daily delivery trucks during the night hours and the 3 daily fuel tankers should not be routed past the Owens mouth or Erwin apartments. Without the Costco gas station, most of these “significant and unavoidable” issues would not exist. All deliveries are currently scheduled to access the same driveway entrance that the existing office building uses.

Response to Comment No. 27-23

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-33 for more information about the proposed haul route for the project. The environmental impacts of the fueling station are evaluated in the Draft EIR, and determined to have less than significant impacts. For more information regarding the environmental analysis associated with the fueling station, please refer to Topical Response No. 4. The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project.

Comment No. 27-24**Page 34 (Cumulative Impacts (1) Aesthetics/Visual Quality and Views- [sic]**

Westfield proposed to work with the existing Crate & Barrel building and allow views and site-lines of the new constructed building to “ensure the visual quality of these projects would not be out of scale or character of the surrounding area”. [sic] The plans for the Topanga Canyon Blvd. side of the Village project looks very nice and I have no issues with the proposed design. However, the aesthetics of the project stop just before the proposed parking structure and open parking (1755 spaces in Phase I or 18% of the entire project area) and the Costco area (165,759sf, or 37% of the entire project area). These figures were calculated using Westfield’s square footage on page 6.

Response to Comment No. 27-24

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project including the parking areas and the anchor retailer. The 1,755 parking spaces to be provided in Phase 1 would comprise an area of approximately 227,300 square feet, while the proposed anchor retailer would consist of approximately 165,759 square feet. The Phase 1 parking spaces and the anchor retail area would be comparable to approximately 17.5% and 12.75%, respectively, of the approximately 1,299,817 square foot project site. In addition, the 227,300 square foot parking area and the proposed 165,759 square foot anchor retailer would comprise approximately 22.1% and 16.1%, respectively, of the total proposed new

development of 1,027,994 square feet. Please also refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR for additional information regarding the change in the net area of the project site due to the additional dedications and relocated property lines requested by the City.

Comment No. 27-25

Page 36 (Mitigation Measure A-5)-

Trees will be planted for every four new surface parking spaces. Palm trees shall not be considered in meeting this requirement. This will help mitigate the heat that will be generated from the open parking area. However, when the traffic signal on Victory Blvd. is moved closer to Topanga Canyon Blvd. in order to facilitate the size of the Costco and new entrance into the Village site, the open parking area on the Westfield Topanga Mall will also need to be altered to accommodate this change and line up with the new traffic signal location. The Topanga Mall should therefore be required to follow the same requirement and plant new trees every four spaces to shade the surface parking and should remove the palm trees.

Response to Comment No. 27-25

Improvement of Westfield Topanga is not part of the proposed project, however the Applicant's other development sites will comply with all applicable regulations.

Comment No. 27-26

Page 44 (B- Cumulative Impacts, 2-Operation)-

The "operational emissions from the build out of the project would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. There could be an estimated 90 cars (refer to page 110 of the Executive Summary of the DEIR) either idling in a queue or at the 20 pump gas station. Excessive emissions can be eliminated if the member-only gas station is removed from the project.

Response to Comment No. 27-26

Operational emissions from the buildout of the project would exceed the SCAQMD's project-level regional emissions threshold for VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and would therefore also result in significant cumulative regional air quality impacts. Localized impacts associated with the gasoline station (e.g., vehicle idling) along with delivery truck idling and delivery truck usage of truck refrigeration units, emergency generator testing,

charbroilers, etc. were addressed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. As presented in Table IV.B-8 on page 381 of the Draft EIR, operation-related daily maximum localized emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, localized operational emissions resulting from the project would not result in a significant long-term impact and no mitigation measures would be required. According to the SCAQMD, if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds, then the project would also result in a cumulative impact. If a project is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan and does not exceed localized significance thresholds, it does not cumulatively contribute to a significant impact. Therefore, it was concluded in the Draft EIR that the project would result in a less than significant cumulative localized impact. In addition, as discussed above in Response to Comment No. 27-22, an anchor retailer with a fueling station in comparison to an anchor retailer without a fueling station would likely result in reduced vehicular trips and vehicle miles travelled from a regional emissions standpoint as compared to customers using a fueling station elsewhere.

Please note that air toxic impacts associated with these sources were also addressed in the Draft EIR. As shown in Table IV.B-10 on page 385 of the Draft EIR, the project would not emit carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that result in impacts which exceed the maximum individual cancer risk of ten in one million or the chronic or acute index of 1.0. Therefore, project-related and cumulative toxic emission impacts would be less than significant.

Comment No. 27-27

The community at large already has access to several competitive gas stations within close proximity of the Village site.

Response to Comment No. 27-27

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 6 for a more detailed discussion about any significant adverse economic consequences that may occur in the surrounding market area as a result of the member-only fueling station.

Comment No. 27-28**Page 45 (B- Cumulative Impacts, 3-Globa [sic] Climate Change)-**

The entire Westfield Village site could strive to obtain the “Silver Rating” under the LEED Green Building Program is the member-only gas station and tire installations center is omitted.

Page 47 (C- Mitigation Measures, Mitigation Measure B-11)-

“Silver Rating” should be a goal of all new construction in Warner Center.

Response to Comment No. 27-28

The majority of the project would be designed to achieve the standards of the Silver Rating under the USGBC’s Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design (“LEED”) green building program, or equivalent green building standards. The anchor retailer building would be designed to achieve the standards of LEED Certified, or an equivalent green building standard, at minimum. The project would also be designed to meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles’ Green Building Code. Thus, as described in more detail in Section II, Project Description, the project would incorporate an environmentally sustainable design utilizing green building technologies that involve more resource-efficient modes of construction through energy efficiency, water conservation, environmentally preferable building materials, and waste reduction to create a building design that would be environmentally sustainable. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, specific sustainability features proposed as part of the project would include secure and covered bicycle storage areas for occupants, shower and changing facilities for hotel employees, and the provision of preferred parking to low-emitting (“Zero Emission Vehicles”) and fuel-efficient vehicles for the retail and office components of the project.

Comment No. 27-29

Truck idling is requested to be limited to five minutes, per the California Air Resources Board’s Airborne Toxic Control Measure. Costco is expected to have 3 daily fuel truck deliveries [sic] and 7-12 large delivery trucks after hours. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to have these vehicles idle for less than five minutes.

Response to Comment No. 27-29

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure B-11, the idling of delivery trucks shall be limited to a maximum of five minutes. This requirement applies to all delivery trucks, including those deliveries to the anchor retailer.

Comment No. 27-30**Page 48 (D- Level of Significance After Mitigation, 1-Construction)-**

All construction will have impact on pollutant thresholds and traffic. It is unavoidable and understandable. I have no problem with the construction issues in the DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 27-30

This comment, summarizing the regional significant and unavoidable air quality impacts of the project and the Commentor's opinion about the construction issues raised in the Draft EIR, is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-31**Page 52 and 53 (C-Geology and Soils, A-Environmental Impacts, 3-Groundwater)-**

There are three 30,000 gallon capacity underground gasoline storage tanks and a five-island fuel facility with 20 fueling positions proposed to be installed at the northeast corner of the site. The groundwater was tested while a drought was existing [sic] in the San Fernando Valley. At that time, the highwater [sic] level underlying the project site was approximately 15ft bgs. The footnote #18 memo was dated Nov. 16, 2010, but the actual exploratory borings were done earlier than that date. The member-only fuel station is to be placed approximately 16ft bgs. I see this as a problem! No amount of "using localized sump pumps and trenches" will completely correct this natural draining corner of the property. Westfield states that the underground spring will be diverted and surface water runoff will also be relocated. This is a natural underground stream and could naturally divert back to its current location over time.

Due to the past two years of heavy rainfall, new borings should be done to confirm that the water table has not risen above the previous 15ft bs [sic] highwater [sic] level. The depth and location of the underground gasoline storage tanks should be reviewed.

Response to Comment No. 27-31

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for more information regarding the groundwater level in the vicinity of the fuel station, and the fuel station's safety features that would be employed to prevent contamination of underground water. Depending on the time of construction, some degree of dewatering may be necessary. It is anticipated that dewatering would only occur during construction of the underground storage tanks as part of the proposed fueling station, at excavations of more than 16 feet below existing grades, and possibly during the installation of a deep sewer line connection. If dewatering is needed during construction, it would be a temporary activity in order to pour concrete and complete other construction activities. Once foundations have been poured and cured, the dewatering effort halts, and groundwater is reintroduced naturally, rising to normal levels.

As a point of clarification, the "natural underground stream" referenced is a manmade, concrete-lined drainage swale at the southwest corner of the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue. No mapped underground stream has been officially identified within the project site.

Comment No. 27-32

Building codes were upgraded with the 1972 earthquake in Sylmar. The 1995 Northridge earthquake also cause [sic] local damage and liquefaction in some areas of the Valley. Underground gasoline storage tanks should have an environmentally safe incase [sic] there is another significant earthquake within the 20 year average.

Response to Comment No. 27-32

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a discussion of the potential for liquefaction at the location of the fueling station and the seismic standards that would be implemented for the fueling station and underground storage tanks.

Comment No. 27-33**Page 54 (C-Geology and Soils, C-Mitigation Measures, Mitigation Measure C-3)-**

Westfield water table analysis done during a drought era in Warner Center already show [sic] it will be well within the 2ft limits. Therefore, Westfield needs to "retain an experienced engineer for design of a dewatering system". [sic] "Heavy equipment" shall be kept off of the lower three feet of excavation of the underground storage tanks. When completed, daily delivery by 3 fuel tanks will be parked directly on top of this area. A re-analysis of the location of the gas station should be done due to water table issues, construction issues

and environmental issues should a gasoline tank in that specific area be compromised during an earthquake.

Response to Comment No. 27-33

As described in Mitigation Measures C-2 and C-3, in Section IV.C, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, a qualified geotechnical engineer shall be present on the project site during excavation, grading, and general site-preparation activities to monitor the implementation of the recommendations, as specified in the Draft EIR, as well as other recommendations that may be made in subsequent geotechnical investigations for the project. Also described in Mitigation Measure C-3, if groundwater is within 2 feet of the bottom of the proposed excavations for installation of the underground storage tanks at the time of construction, the Applicant shall retain an experienced engineer for design of a dewatering system. The dewatering system shall be installed by a contractor specializing in dewatering under similar soil conditions.

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for more information regarding safety measures associated with the fueling station and underground storage tanks, seismic standards that would be implemented for the fueling station and underground storage tanks, and additional information regarding the groundwater levels in the location of the fueling station.

Comment No. 27-34

Page 57 (D-Surface Water Hydrology and Surface Water Quality, 2-Operation, a-Surface Water Hydrology)-

How will the surface parking be in anyway considered for a LEED rating? Woodland Hills/Warner Center has reported 118 degree temperatures during the summer. If “impervious areas of the site = 95%, how will this summer heat be dissipated?”

Response to Comment No. 27-34

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-28 regarding LEED. Also refer to Response to comment 19-33 regarding measures proposed to reduce heat effects.

Comment No. 27-35

The “volume and velocity of storm water runoff have the potential to cause flooding and increase the amount of surface in a water body”...so during a heavy rainfall, where will this

water go as “the existing draining swale within the southwest portion of the side would be paved over a surface parking”?

Suggestion: Surface water could be diverted for gray-water usage at the Village site. Underground storage tanks could be for processing this gray-water instead of storing potentially toxic gasoline....and a potential environmental hazard.

Response to Comment No. 27-35

As described in Section IV.D, Surface Water Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, the project would include on-site detention facilities, such as oversized pipes and/or vaults that would detain flows such that post-project flows would be attenuated to pre-project conditions. Currently, recycled water infrastructure and service is not available in the project area. In addition, there is currently no reclaimed water infrastructure on the project site or vicinity. If recycled water infrastructure and service becomes feasible, and certain phases of the project are eligible to participate, provisions will be considered for implementation.

Comment No. 27-36

Page 61 an [sic] 62 (E-Land Use, a-Environmental Impacts, 1-Land Use Consistency, s-Community Plan)-

The Village proposes to be a “mix of land uses”, [sic] and “create an integrated, regional center and pedestrian-oriented project with an abundance of streetscape improvements and open space elements to promote pedestrian activity within”. [sic] If 18% of the site in Phase I is parking and 95% of that parking is impervious, how will this be an improvement to the open space elements? It will be a sea of parked vehicles and Costco shopping carts on half of the Village site and a “commercial district” located complete [sic] separate from the Costco area. This is NOT creating an “enhanced appearance of the commercial district or creating a single unified regional center with connections to adjacent commercial and residential areas and transit service”. [sic] This is creating two distinct areas that will not promote a unified “Village” atmosphere.

Response to Comment No. 27-36

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, over 2 acres of pedestrian-only gathering spaces would be developed as part of the project. These spaces will include a combination of walkable paseos linking the retail, office, hotel, and parking uses, and amply landscaped and shaded courtyards, which will provide active areas for special events, dining, seating areas, and other amenities to enhance the pedestrian experience. In addition, as

discussed and illustrated in Topical Response No. 5 and illustrated in Figures II-28 and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed to promote pedestrian access throughout and around the project site. Furthermore, as shown in Figure II-18 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, a comprehensive landscape plan and streetscape improvements would also be implemented that would serve to integrate and unify the project site.

Comment No. 27-37

Page 63 and 64 (E-Land Use, a-Environmental Impacts, 1-Land Use Consistency, c-Warner Center Specific Plan)-

The project does not create an “integrated, mixed-commercial use and pedestrian-orientated development”. [sic] There is no connectivity between the Costco site and the retail area. They are separated by a proposed 100ft tall parking structure and the buildings are oriented away from each other.

Only on the Topanga Canyon Blvd. side of the project are these objectives of the Warner Center Specific Plan designed to be met. The Costco side and Parking Building area are designed to support one retail store (Costco) only and not become a “destination” for the Warner Center population. If you are not a “member”, [sic] there is no access given to the general public on the Costco side of the Village project to their retail facility, gas court or food court. There are NO “meandering sidewalks, multi-use trails or mini-plazas [sic] “within” the project site in the Costco area of the Village project.

Response to Comment No. 27-37

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-9 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding how the anchor retailer and adjacent retail uses would be integrated with one another. The areas surrounding the anchor retailer would be publicly accessible. In addition, as shown in the Conceptual Landscape Plan provided in Figure II-18 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, a multi-use trail, meandering sidewalks, and mini-plazas would be provided to the immediate north of the anchor retailer.

Comment No. 27-38

How will Costco's 20 position gas pump station “reduce vehicle trips and promote the use of alternate modes of transportation”? The very center and crux of the Costco retailer desiring to re-locate from Canoga Part [sic] to this Village sites [sic] is the 20 position gas pump station. If “alternate modes of transportation” is the goal of the Village project, then to purchase gasoline at member-only prices will cause members to drive their vehicles

specifically to this location to get gas and NOT use alternate modes of transportation. As Costco is a big-box retailer, most purchases are bought in bulk and therefore will make “alternate transportation” be [sic] unfeasible.

Response to Comment No. 27-38

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-49.

Comment No. 27-39

“The existing Warner Center Specific Plan will govern this project”, [sic] but consideration of the updates and changes should be considered from the Draft Warner Center Specific Plan as it related to urban-planning.

Response to Comment No. 27-39

Pursuant to the project’s Vesting Tentative Tract Map (69943), the existing Warner Center Specific Plan will govern the project rather than future revisions to the Specific Plan adopted by the City. However, Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR does analyze the project’s consistency with the primary urban planning goals of the Proposed Draft Specific Plan. Please refer to pages 509 and 513–515 of the Draft EIR for this analysis.

Comment No. 27-40

Page 65 (E-Land Use, a-Environmental Impacts, 1-Land Use Consistency, d-Los Angeles Municipal Code)-

The Village Project is seeking approval of a “CUP” for automotive uses and a member-only fueling station, as well as the hauling route through residential neighborhoods to get the gasoline to the site. A new five-island 20 fueling station facility would not be allowed in the Draft Warner Center Specific Plan. This facility and the member-only tire installation center and member-only auto sales will definitely have an impact on the surrounding land uses.

Response to Comment No. 27-40

The proposed fueling station and automotive uses are currently permitted uses in the project site’s (WC)C2 zone. The project is requesting a conditional use permit to extend the hours of operation of these two uses and to approve the development standards of the tire installation center, which would be located in the interior of the site, more than 300 feet from Owensmouth Avenue, and would not be visible from the public roadway. The Draft EIR thoroughly analyzed the environmental impact of the proposed fueling station and

automotive uses. Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for additional analysis of the proposed fueling station's environmental impacts.

Comment No. 27-41

Trees will not screen off idling vehicles, gasoline fumes, 3-a-day fuel delivery truck activity and queues of vehicles waiting access to the fuel area. The "gateway" is to be situated directly in front of the proposed Costco fueling area. There are environmental health risks in breathing in gasoline fumes...which would be unavoidable with a fueling station on that Owensmouth/Victory corner. It is also at that corner where a Bus Stop is currently located.

Response to Comment No. 27-41

As discussed above in Response to Comment 27-26, a detailed health risk assessment was conducted for the project and included potential air toxic emissions from the proposed gasoline station. Potential health risk impacts from air toxic emissions released from the project site are primarily a concern from a carcinogenic standpoint. Carcinogenic impacts are evaluated assuming an outdoor exposure of 24-hours per day for a 70-year duration. Selection of sensitive receptors was conducted consistent with CalEPA, SCAQMD, and CARB guidance. Since people using the "gateway" and bus stop would be at these locations for substantially less time than 70 years, these locations were not included as sensitive receptors in the health risk assessment. People using the benches and bus stop surrounding the project site would be exposed to much fewer emissions than modeled in this analysis. The closest sensitive receptors included in the analysis were multi-family residences along Owensmouth Avenue (approximately 300 feet east of the project site) and residential units northwest and west of the Owensmouth Avenue (single-family residential uses are approximately 250 feet northwest of the project site at the closest point).

As shown in Table IV.B-10 on page 385 of the Draft EIR, the results of the health risk assessment yielded a maximum off-site individual cancer risk of 3.9 in a million (below the threshold of 10 in one million) at the residences located to the east of the project site. The maximum chronic and acute risk occurred within this same residential area east of the project site. The maximum chronic and acute hazard index was 0.45 and 0.02 (below the threshold of 1.0 for chronic and acute risk), respectively. The fueling station represented approximately 18 percent of the total risk from the project. As the project would not emit carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that result in impacts which exceed the maximum individual cancer risk of ten in one million or the chronic or acute index of 1.0, project-related toxic emission impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

Gasoline vapor from the fueling station would be further limited as the gasoline nozzles would be equipped with Phase II enhanced vapor recovery and the underground storage tanks would be equipped with a Phase I vapor recovery system. In addition, the proposed gasoline station would be required to comply with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards (29 CFR 1910) for limiting exposure to benzene (the primary pollutant of concern associated with gasoline). As concluded in the Draft EIR, the project would result in a less than significant health risk impact.

Comment No. 27-42

Page 72 (E-Land Use, a-Environmental Impacts, 3-Urban Decay)-

The proposed relocation of Costco from Rosco Blvd. and Canoga Ave. to the Village project will cause urban decay at the original Canoga Park location if the site is left unused. The DEIR refers to "if Costco were to relocate to the project site, the potential to produce adverse competitive conditions for retail floor are [sic] would be lower and less competitive than was estimated:". [sic] For this to be true, a tenant for the original Canoga Park Costco site should already be [sic] in place. Who is this new tenant? How long with the site be vacant?

Response to Comment No. 27-42

As discussed in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, as the lease for the Costco at Roscoe Boulevard will be expiring, this Costco use may relocate to the project site, remain open, or be replaced with another tenant. Should the Costco remain open or be replaced with another tenant, the urban decay analysis determined that there would be sufficient demand in the market area to support an ongoing retail use at the Roscoe location, in addition to the project's new Costco-related retail (i.e., general merchandise, food and beverage, pharmacy/drug store, limited service restaurants), with excess demand remaining for future large retail projects. Additionally, if the existing Costco at Roscoe Boulevard were to relocate to the project site, it is anticipated that there would be sufficient market demand to attract a viable commercial tenant to occupy the building. Hence, there would be no risk of urban decay if the existing Costco, or another retail tenant, remained at the existing location. Furthermore, the Applicant has no control over the future of the building at Roscoe Boulevard that houses an existing Costco.

Comment No. 27-43**Page 122 (H-Traffic Access and Parking, d-Level of Significance After Mitigation, 2-Operation, c-Neighborhood Intrusion)-**

“The neighborhood impact analysis indicates that portions of the four neighborhoods could be potentially impacted due the cut-through traffic as a result of the project”. [sic] Additional analysis should be done concerning these four neighborhood areas in regards to delivery routes used by the vendors at the Village. Perhaps rerouting the delivery routes to use the major boulevards instead of Owensmouth and Erwin, thus reducing the “greatest impact” on the neighborhoods from this project. Charging a WCSP’s TIA Fee will not reduce the intrusion into the existing neighborhoods.

Response to Comment No. 27-43

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a detailed discussion of the project’s potential neighborhood impacts and neighborhood protection program.

Comment No. 27-44**Page 124 (I.1-Utilities-Water Supply, a-Environmental Impacts, 2-Operation, a-Water Demand)”**

Recycled water could be utilized for on-site landscape irrigation and non-permeable surface cleaning” but “construction of these recycled water pipeline improvements to the project site is uncertain and recycled water use was conservatively not accounted for in the project’s net water demand”. [sic] 95% of the site is non-permeable surface (as described in the DEIR) so gray-water or recycled water should be of utmost importance in Warner Center’s draught-plagued area. There is plenty of area that could be used for recycling water.....the entire Phase II area, for example, or the surface parking surrounding Costco.

Response to Comment No. 27-44

Currently, recycled water infrastructure and service is not available in the project area. There is currently no reclaimed water infrastructure on the project site or vicinity. If recycled water infrastructure and service becomes feasible, and certain phases of the project are eligible to participate, provisions will be considered for implementation. In addition, the project would incorporate numerous water conservation features, as well as bioswales, retention basins, and water shed management plans, where appropriate.

Comment No. 27-45**Additional Comments and notes:**

“Open spaces should be integrated to provide for a pedestrian-orientated central space”, [sic] as stated on page 12 of the Executive Summary of the DEIR. There is zero open space along the front of Costco where customers will enter the building. They will share this space with the tire installation center and he [sic] kiosk for automotive sales, as well as the loading dock and storage of excess boxes and garbage bins.. [sic] There is zero open space within the project due to substantial surface parking. The “central space” on the site plan is the “parking structure”. [sic] Any landscape between the back of the 450ft long back of the Costco building is on the “outside” of the project, results [sic] in a pedestrian dead-zone. There are no windows or any openings into the Village from Victory, from Owensmouth to the new signal to be located between Costco and Crate and Barrel [sic] The Costco gas station is located at the “gateway” to the Village and is not open to the public or community....as it is member-only.

Response to Comment No. 27-45

As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas would be provided within the central interior portion of the site. This landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space would include pedestrian seating, enhanced paving, planters, as well as landscaping that would include accent trees. Water features may also be provided. In addition, as part of the project, improvements along each of the street fronts would be provided. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project’s pedestrian-oriented open space areas, the design of the project including the façade of the anchor retailer, and the streetscape improvements that include gateway elements. The Commentor is correct in that the fueling station is proposed as a "member-only" facility.

Comment No. 27-46

No renderings/pictures of the Village show the elevations looking at the front of Costco and towards the 100ft tall parking structure. **It is this half of the Village project that I voice my objections.**

Response to Comment No. 27-46

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the design of the parking structure, exhibits showing the anchor retailer façades, and exhibits showing the parking structure façades.

Comment No. 27-47

It appears that the Costco portion of the Village site is set up to be sold off separately to Costco and perhaps share the 100ft parking stretcher. [sic] This is the only conclusion I can rationalize as to why Westfield has no distinct or even safe pedestrian pathways designed through the open parking area (to connect bus riders on Owensmouth to the retail/restaurants near Topanga Canyon) or any common gathering areas near the “middle” of the “Village”, [sic] as requested and anticipated by the community. It looks like they are two separate retail projects, separated by a big box parking structure.

Response to Comment No. 27-47

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a detailed description of the site’s pedestrian connections, including the connection from Owensmouth Avenue into the site. As shown in Figure II-8 and Figure II-29 of Section II, Project Description, there are multiple walkable pathways and multi-use trails throughout the project site, including pedestrian paths through the parking areas from Owensmouth to restaurants and retail areas on Topanga Canyon. In addition, as shown in the internal pedestrian access graphic provided in Topical Response No. 5, the primary pedestrian path through the parking area would be clearly demarcated so as to minimize pedestrian/vehicular conflicts.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, over two acres of pedestrian only gathering spaces would be developed as part of the project. These spaces, which would link the retail, office and hotel uses are envisioned as a combination of walkable paseos between buildings, which link to parking and amply landscaped and shady plazas, which would be active and lively with special events, dining, seating areas, water features and other amenities to enhance the pedestrian experience. Furthermore, as shown in Figure II-18 of Section II, Project Description, a comprehensive landscape plan and streetscape improvements would also be implemented that would integrate and unify the project site.

Comment No. 27-48

There are many financial incentives for Warner Center businesses under the **Business Enterprise Zone**.

- Costco will earn a \$37,400 tax credit for each qualifying employee hired. If an estimated 150 new employees are hired at the Village site, which [sic] will give them \$5,610,000. What about the additional 200 employees who will lose their jobs at the Canoga Park location. If there are “terminated” and then “re-hired”, [sic] this will generate another $200 \times \$37,400 = \$7,480,000$ in tax credits. In obvious and simple terms, these employees are just moving to a newer location. These tax loop-holes need to be closed so abuse of the system is not allowed.

- There are tax credits for buying machinery and equipment.
- Los Angeles is giving a 35% discount on utilities from DWP.

Response to Comment No. 27-48

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-32 for a discussion of the State's designation of Warner Center as an enterprise zone, and the economic output, job creation, and tax revenues that will be generated by the project. The comment does not raise an issue about the adequacy of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 27-49

Westfields' [sic] original public forum on 10-29-07 had many great ideas and community input was given through several "Great Streets" forums.then the economy caused the project to be put on hold. Then Costco came on board two years later and dictated how the original Village Project was to be extensively modified to accommodate them. The Village was then re-presented as a political "done deal" without any attempt to consult or gather additional input from the Warner Center community at large about these extensive modifications and change in vision.

We need to be pro-active and environmentally prudent. I would like my two sons to be proud of Woodland Hills. Our community has this one opportunity for the retail applicant and community to work TOGETHER, be LEED certified on all construction and be a shining example to other communities of what can be possible at Warner Center.

Response to Comment No. 27-49

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, in response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, the project was reduced in size by approximately 774,000 square feet. In July 2010, a Notice of Community Workshop was mailed to the public with information about the reduced project, including the anchor retailer, and a public meeting was held to present an overview of the refined project. Refer to Response to Comment No. 27-28 regarding LEED. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 28

Gilbert S. Drucker
4605 San Feliciano Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 28-1

As a long time resident (50 years), I want to make clear I am not against further commercial development in this area. I also want to make clear that I am strongly opposed to any development that does not heed the community concerns. I realize that Westfield and Costco are driven by economic conditions so the original plan proposed is no longer feasible. However the current plan proposed which meets economic objects is not in the spirit of their initial plan. I want to point out that the present economy will change, however the resultant project will remain for years. I along with WOODLAND HILLS / WARNER CENTER NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL have a number of concerns. To mention a few:

- Aesthetics (considered not significant by the applicant) in particular '[sic]Big Box' concept
- Increased traffic
- Unsightly parking structures

Response to Comment No. 28-1

This comment introduces the comments regarding the Draft EIR that have been provided by the Commentor. Please refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 5 for a detailed analysis of potential aesthetic impacts associated with the project. Also refer to Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 1 regarding potential traffic impacts associated with the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 28-2

The Neighborhood Council has [sic] working with Westfield based on the planning principals:

- A. Break up the 'super blocks' into more manageably scaled quadrants.
- B. Connect roads to existing and future potential streets/ intersections.

- C. Eliminate the 'Big Box' concept.
- D. Eliminate surface parking.
- E. Locate active uses (retail/ restaurants) at the street level.
- F. Paths and nodes need to be made more discernible.
- G. Eliminate the gas station or integrate it into the other structures.
- H. Use the site at Owensmouth and Victory for a premium use.
- I. Use Type I construction.
- J. Construct either the high rise [sic] office building or hotel in phase one.

Main questions / ideas that were discussed with Westfield - Answers in BOLD

- A. Can you break up the parking structure into smaller buildings? **NO**
- B. Can you reduce the footprint of the Costco Building by making it multistory [sic]? **NO**
- C. Can you move the Costco Building away from Victory Boulevard? **NO.**
- D. Can you put retail on Victory Boulevard? **NO.**
- E. Can you put a Paseo with smaller retail buildings on each side along Victory Boulevard in front of the Costco Building? **NO.**
- F. Can you wrap retail around the Costco Building? **NO.**
- G. Can the surface parking shown behind the Costco Building be housed in a multistory [sic] parking structure? **NO.**
- H. Can you locate parking or other uses such as the promised Community Center on top of the Costco Building? **NO.**
- I. Can the gas station be eliminated? **NO.**

- J. Can the gas station be moved somewhere else on the site? **NO**.
- K. Can you build one of the taller buildings in Phase I? **NO**.
- L. Can you move some of the Costco departments that can be located on exterior walls so windows could be introduced on the lower portions of the building (i.e., the Optometry department)? **NO**.
- M. The Costco building is located so that all sides are exposed. What are you going to do with the outside storage, boxes and pallets we see at other locations? **No response yet**.

It is apparent to me that Westfield thinks their plan is a done deal and they determine what is significant. Why should they bother with the community issues and concerns? My hope is that City Planning put forth the community concerns in the DEIR review process.

Response to Comment No. 28-2

The project Applicant has been working with the community, including the Neighborhood Council, to develop a project that would create a distinctive mixed commercial environment within the community by providing a blend of shopping and dining uses, office space, a hotel, community/cultural uses, and open space in order to provide an active shopping, dining, working, entertainment, and community experience for the Warner Center area. In response to comments from the community, numerous modifications have been made to the original proposal including enhanced articulation to the anchor retailer building frontage along Victory Boulevard, meandering sidewalks and independent multi-use trails around the site's perimeter, complementary treatment to the parking structure façades and dedicated pedestrian pathways from Owensmouth Avenue.

Regarding the planning principles referenced in this comment, many of these principles are addressed by the current project design. Many of these principles have been addressed in the project's anchor retail building design, discussed in detail in Topical Response No. 5.

Topical Response No. 5 describes the project's design to break up the superblock and made the project site manageably scaled for pedestrians; describes the site's vehicular and pedestrian connections; and describes the distinctive pedestrian paths that would be provided. The refined site plan included in Topical Response No. 5 has strengthened the pathways for both vehicles and pedestrians. For example, the pedestrian walkway from Owensmouth, Avenue is more clearly defined, and the courtyard area adjacent to the anchor retail building is also more clearly delineated.

Roads would be connected to existing and future potential streets to some extent, but full roadway connections have not been provided in order to discourage cut-through traffic, which would conflict with pedestrian circulation. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion of the importance of providing an anchor retail tenant at the project site. Surface parking would be minimized and limited to the interior of the site, where it would provide convenient parking for anchor retail customers. Active uses are located at the grade level along the site's internal roadways and open space areas, as well as on the entire length of Topanga Canyon Boulevard. Pedestrian-serving amenities are proposed along public streets where shop fronts are not proposed. The fuel station is an important component of the project and will function most efficiently, with minimum disruption, at the proposed location. The construction used for the project will meet all applicable building codes. Specific components of Phase 2 (e.g., the office and hotel components) will be built when there is adequate market demand.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 29

Mary Jo Fernando
6300 Owensmouth Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 29-1

My name is Mary Jo Fernando. I'm a resident at 6300 Owensmouth Avenue (R3 in the map) which is a Los Angeles Authority Housing for seniors and Disabled in wheelchairs. I'm a disabled person who uses a manual wheelchair when I cross the street going to the Westfield Topanga Canyon Mall. My concern about the construction that is going to take place by next year is how safe will I be when I cross the street going to the mall???????????? Traffic right now at the corner of Owensmouth Ave. and Victory Blvd is very hectic already. I now go to the Target Pharmacy, which is located at the 2nd floor of the Westfield Topanga Canyon Mall at least twice a week to get my medications. I usually go by myself.

Response to Comment No. 29-1

A construction management plan will be developed prior to the beginning of construction activity. If necessary, any streetscape modifications related to construction period lane closures and/or sidewalk diversions will be developed to meet ADA requirements. Standard pedestrian controls and timing would be maintained for all street crossings.

Comment No. 29-2

Another concern is the members' only gas station that you are planning to build at the project area. There is already one gas station located at Vanowen and Topanga Cyn Blvd just across [sic] Canoga High School (R4 in the map). The projected gas station will emit more toxic particles in the environment surrounding residential areas.

Response to Comment No. 29-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-41 for additional information regarding the health risk assessment conducted for the project, including potential air toxic emissions from the fueling station.

Comment No. 29-3

These plus the noise of the construction vibrations that the building is going to create due to the jack hammering activities that will surely affect more earthquakes in the area [sic]

Response to Comment No. 29-3

As discussed in Section IV.F, Noise, of the Draft EIR, the project's construction activities would generate vibration levels that would be well below the significance threshold and were therefore found to be less than significant. In addition, earthquakes are caused by fault rupture within the earth's crust and as discussed in Section IV.C, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, the project site is not located within a State-designated earthquake fault zone or City-designated fault rupture study area. Furthermore, no known active or potentially active faults underlie the project site.

Comment No. 29-4

as well as the asbestos that will be emitted due to the demolition.

Response to Comment No. 29-4

If asbestos containing materials were found prior to demolition, they would be removed in compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, as well as all other State and Federal rules and regulations. Only asbestos trained and certified abatement personnel would be allowed to perform asbestos abatement. All asbestos containing material removed from on-site structures would be hauled to a licensed receiving facility and disposed of by a transportation company certified to handle asbestos. Therefore, with compliance with federal, state, and local regulations, potentially hazardous impacts associated with asbestos containing materials would be less than significant.

Comment No. 29-5

Will the village pay for our medical and caregiver expenses now that the State of California is cutting everything due to the state budget cuts? I don't think so.

Response to Comment No. 29-5

The project would provide tax revenues to the City which would help to support the continued availability of public services offered by the City to the community. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 29-6

I'm hoping that you will give consideration with regard to these matters. Thank you very much for your time.

Response to Comment No. 29-6

All comments submitted to the City of Los Angeles regarding the Draft EIR have been responded to as part of this Final EIR and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 30

Ronald Fischer & Judith Fischer
23730 Canzonet St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 30-1

We have reviewed the EIR referenced above. We note the following:

Ugly parking lot frontage on Owensmouth

Response to Comment No. 30-1

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 30-2

Questionable frontage along Victory with a very long wall for the anchor store

Response to Comment No. 30-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the façade of the anchor retailer and proposed streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 30-3

Only one ingress/egress along all of Victory

Only one ingress/egress along all of Topanga Canyon

Response to Comment No. 30-3

The statement is incorrect in that there is more than one access point along both Victory Boulevard and along Topanga Canyon Boulevard. The primary access point on Victory Boulevard at Westfield Way is signalized; a secondary driveway is located just west of Owensmouth Avenue. Another primary access point is located on Topanga Canyon Boulevard, approximately mid-block and signalized. Additional secondary driveways are

located immediately north and south of the mid-block driveway. All secondary driveways are stop-controlled and a restricted to right-turn access/egress only.

Comment No. 30-4

Dramatically increased traffic at the corner of Topanga Canyon and Victory – already very heavy

Response to Comment No. 30-4

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Victory Boulevard, the Project impacts at this intersection will be mitigated to a level below significance. Mitigation measures H-8, H-9, H-34, and H-35 are designed to alleviate the addition of project traffic through physical improvements and TDM-type measures.

Comment No. 30-5

No assurances about the landscaping (similar promises were made for the center on the north corner of Victory and Canoga with dismal results)

Response to Comment No. 30-5

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's proposed landscaping, which would include mature and ample landscaping.

Comment No. 30-6

No increased employment with Costco at this site. The Canoga Park Costco site will close (per Councilman's [sic] Zine's office).

Response to Comment No. 30-6

As indicated in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, full build-out of project is expected to generate up to 2,687 on-site employees. Of these new jobs, the Costco retailer specifically is expected to generate 350 on-site employees. Although the lease of the existing Costco in Canoga Park will expire in 2014, it is unknown at this time whether the existing Costco at Canoga Park would close. However, if this were to occur, since the proposed Costco location would employ a larger number of employees than the existing Costco at Canoga Park, it would still result in the creation of additional employment opportunities in the area. As noted on Page 163 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, if employees at the existing Costco at Roscoe Boulevard were to relocate to the

project site, approximately 150 net new employees would still be generated by the proposed Costco retailer.

Comment No. 30-7

Not the vision promised by Westfield. How can they be trusted now??

Response to Comment No. 30-7

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, in response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, several changes to the project were made to reduce the project's size. Overall, the modifications reduced the size of the project by approximately 774,000 square feet. In addition, in response to additional input from the community, numerous modifications to the site plan have been made. The project will continue to be subject to input by the community and input from the City of Los Angeles until an ultimate decision regarding the project is made by the City as part of its public hearing process. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 30-8

We are not pleased with the current proposal and would like to see smaller stores, restaurants, theaters, and social settings. There is nothing inviting or attractive about a location with Costco and its Tire Center, Gas Station, and hundreds of shopping carts abandoned around the site.

Response to Comment No. 30-8

In addition to the anchor retailer, the project would include a mix of uses that would include smaller retail stores, restaurants, a theater, a hotel, office uses, a grocery store, a community use, and areas within the site for people to socialize. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 31

Joyce Fletcher
22123 Independencia St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 31-1

I have reviewed The Village at Westfield Topanga Draft Environmental Impact Report (ENV-2007-3393-EIR). As a member of the Woodland Hills/Warner Center Neighborhood Council and an active community member I have had the opportunity to be at many Community Meetings where Westfield has introduced the general scope of the project and asked for input from the NC and the community.

Neighbors, local business people, local and city wide [sic] newspapers have requested and suggested changes should be made to the project. Changes that will better reflect the needs of the community. I am disappointed to see that Westfield has chosen to not include nor respond to these ideas and requests.

Westfield introduced the general plan to the community almost a year ago. One year later it is the exact same plan.

I have spent hours looking over endless amounts of data and requests for mitigation that benefit Westfield but not the community. It is too much data for a project that amounts to very little: a Costco Warehouse, a 26 pump Costco gas station, a six story parking garage, a few small retail shops and a large cement parking lot. And, a second phase that Westfield has said repeatedly that they may never build.

I have made my best effort to comment specifically on the following issues and concerns as they relate to this project:

Response to Comment No. 31-1

The proposed member-only fueling station would include a total of 20 fueling stations and the parking structure would be up to 90 feet in height. As discussed in Response to Comment No. 25-2, the community has had several opportunities to provide input on the project and will continue to have several opportunities to provide input as the project moves through the entitlement process. In response to community input, several refinements to the design of the project were made that include improvements to the project's circulation, access, and visual corridors. Refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a more detailed discussion regarding refinements to the site plan.

Comment No. 31-2

1) **Not appropriate for the location. Urban Decay-** This location is the last large piece of open space in Woodland Hills and sits in the center of the community (Topanga and Victory Blvd [sic]). The Warner Center Specific Plan defines future building/construction in Warner Center as needing high dense urban building that will create an active downtown environment. A neighborhood gathering place for community recreational activities, entertainment, business activities combined with multi-use living and shopping structures.

By building a 450 foot long Costco, a large parking lot and a large parking garage on this site Westfield is building the absolute opposite of the goals of the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 31-2

The project would be consistent with the vision for the Warner Center area set forth by adopted plans. Specifically, as discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project conforms to the Specific Plan and would be consistent with the land use designations and the intent of the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan and the General Plan Framework Element. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 31-3

2) **Site Access and Internal Circulation.** The DEIR has not addressed concerns related to these issues. There is not enough room on the site to comfortably place a Costco Warehouse Store, a 26 station Costco gas station, and (2) 6 story parking garages. **Therefore, there is not enough room left to accommodate sidewalks and streets. The DEIR consistently glosses over these very real safety and aesthetic issues.** Also, the size of the site only allows for Westfield to place the (450 long) [sic] Costco to sit with the back of the store against Victory Blvd. This blocks access to the inside of the shopping center. A large parking lot and six story parking garage further limits movement of cars and pedestrian. [sic] **Westfield has ignored these issues and concerns at meetings and in the DEIR.**

Response to Comment No. 31-3

Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, pages 798-800, of the Draft EIR provides an analysis of the project's potential impacts to access and internal circulation. Based on the analysis provided therein, the site access will adequately serve the project's access needs.

The statement of a “26 station Costco gas station” is incorrect; the project proposes a 20-pump fueling station. The project site complies with the setback requirements of Section 10 of the Specific Plan. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the size of the dedications and setbacks on Victory Boulevard, including the setback of the anchor retailer and the anchor retail building’s design. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding access at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 31-4

3) **Surface Parking - Parking Lot Trees** – On the Village DEIR site plan drawings, Westfield shows (1) tree per (4) cars. When the city approved Westfield’s 2007 plan for the Crate and Barrel (DIR 2006-9714 (SPP) [sic] on the same piece of property, the city required Westfield to plant (1) tree per (4) cars. The fact is that either [sic] Westfield did not comply. At Crate and Barrel Westfield planted (1) tree for every (10) cars. **As the Village plan has a huge expanse of concrete parking lot I feel the city and the community needs to see further detailed drawings of the parking lot, drawings of the landscape and statements from Westfield of their guarantee to comply when they build.**

Response to Comment No. 31-4

The project will provide trees in the surface parking areas consistent with Section 10 of the Specific Plan. Specifically, the project would provide one canopy tree for every four new surface parking spaces within those surface parking areas that would not be replaced as part of Phase 2. Where the surface parking areas will become construction sites for Phase 2, however, planting of trees is not proposed since such trees would need to be removed for construction activities. However, if permit applications for Phase 2 are not submitted to the City prior to certificate of occupancy for full buildout of Phase 1, the Applicant will provide trees within those Phase 1 surface parking areas that are planned for Phase 2 construction. These trees may remain in planters so they can be removed for future construction, in an interim configuration to be submitted for approval by the Department of Planning; since permanent irrigation may not be installed during this interim period, such proposed plan may cluster the trees as needed to allow for hand watering, provided the total number of trees provided for the interim plan is not less than 1 container tree per 4 spaces in the interim surface parking area. Please refer to Figure II-18 for the Conceptual Landscaping Plan proposed to be implemented as part of the project.

Comment No. 31-5

4) **Pedestrian and Driver Safety Issues** – There are many conceptual drawings in the DEIR. The drawings all depict problems with the over-all [sic] design as it relates to traffic and pedestrian safety.

Specifically:

a) Cars leaving the Costco 26 car gas station: The drawing shows the ONLY exit to be a one car wide “open area” hidden behind two trees, the 26 cars would then try to merge into a one car lane of traffic leaving the center, which will then merge onto Victory Blvd. This is not addressed in the DEIR.

b) At the main entrance to Costco off Victory, the first STOP sign is at the left to the Costco loading docks. This appears to be a “blind-spot” when turning right, because of the shape of the Costco Building and the length of loading docks. This is not addressed the DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 31-5

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for a discussion of the fuel station’s entrance and exit points. The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project.

The loading dock area is designed for the maneuverability of both passenger and large vehicles; this design includes the practice of incorporating the appropriate sight distances for safe circulation.

Comment No. 31-6

c) The parking garage. The parking garage sits a distance from the Costco Warehouse Store. The BACK of the proposed retail stores FACES the partially enclosed garage.

Per the drawings: For a shopper to get from the garage to the retail stores which face Topanga ... the shopper is required to walk through the garage, along the back of the stores, (which is an alley) then along the side (which is a driveway into the garage) of the stores to eventually get to the front of the stores. The DEIR does not address access from the parking garages to the retail areas.

The DEIR does not address streets, driveways, pedestrian walkways, [sic] sidewalks. The draft DEIR does not address street or parking garage safety.

Response to Comment No. 31-6

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project's pedestrian connections, including from Owensmouth Avenue. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts. The design of the parking areas and the roadways within the site and the movement of bicycles and pedestrians within the site are all consistent with industry standards and have been tested at hundreds of shopping centers and mixed-use developments across the nation.

Comment No. 31-7

5) **Community Recreation Center** - In meetings with the public, Rotary Meetings, Chamber Meetings and meetings with the Neighborhood Council Westfield repeatedly states that there will be a Community Center on the property in the Village. HOWEVER, IN THE DEIR, what Westfield refers to as a Community Center is ACTUALLY the meeting rooms, ballrooms, etc., inside the proposed second phase hotel. Meeting rooms that the hotel will rent to the neighborhood if they want to hold a function. Westfield has conveniently *insinuated* that a Community Recreation Center will be built, when in fact this is a lie that has been marketed well.

Response to Comment No. 31-7

The community/cultural center proposed as part of the project will not be located in the meeting rooms or ballrooms within the proposed hotel. In addition, the programming of the community center and how it will be administered, including any costs, is still being considered by the Applicant. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 and Response to Comment No. 18-34 for a discussion of the proposed community center.

Comment No. 31-8

In fact much of what is said in the DEIR is an untruth that has been marketed well and highly publicized by the best promoters that a lot of Westfield money can buy. Why is Westfield doing this? Because they can. Because coupled with Costco Warehouse Stores they have unlimited resources and the opportunity to make billions more. They have often bragged about the amount of money they will make from the citizens of Woodland Hills. When I have asked them if this project is right for the location ... they have said to me "we own the land and we can do anything they want to with it". [sic] I am asking City Planning to PLEASE LOOK AT THE DEIR CAREFULLY and look past the gloss and spin. Please

read what is being said beneath the surface. I think you will be surprised. I hope you will be motivated to please help us because we very much need your help. You are our only chance.

Response to Comment No. 31-8

The Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA requirements. Potential impacts have been fully disclosed and are based on the significance thresholds and methodologies set forth within the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, the Draft EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Los Angeles. Modified site plans proposed by the community were also analyzed as Alternative F - Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for more information. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 32

Kathi Flood
kathiaart@earthlink.net
www.kathiflood.com

Comment No. 32-1

Thank you for forwarding the EIR CD to us. Our response, as family residents of Woodland Hills for fifty years, is that this area is way over the top too much commercial.

Response to Comment No. 32-1

The proposed use of the project site is consistent with the designated commercial uses set forth in the Warner Center Specific Plan and the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 32-2

This development would do a GREAT disservice to the community, as we are in need of open space, parks, and recreational areas. Westfield is a blight on this country because it produces slick, uniform, expensive corporate shopping areas that spit in the face of a true democracy.

Response to Comment No. 32-2

While the project does not include a public park, the project would include several publicly accessible landscaped open-space areas, as well as proposed multi-use trails. Specifically, as discussed in more detail in Topical Response No. 5, upon completion of the project, the project site would include over two acres of pedestrian gathering spaces. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 32-3

A true democracy would encourage small business, fair competition, and production of local products. Please stop this mega-corporate nightmare.

Response to Comment No. 32-3

This comment does not raise any environmental issues pertaining to the CEQA process. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 32-4

And the fact that they do not keep up their website to give the community information is further evidence of their lack of willingness to interface with the people who live in the area. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 32-4

The Applicant's website is not associated with the environmental review process being conducted by the City of Los Angeles for the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 33

Gloria & Julio Freeman
22382 Alguas Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
juliop@specialtyroofing.com

Comment No. 33-1

As a resident of Woodland Hills for nearly 40 years, we have been appreciative of the fact that we are able to live in a beautiful and upscale neighborhood. We have seen many projects built with design structure fitted to the enhancement of the area.

For this reason I feel that putting a warehouse type structure in the heart of Woodland Hills would be a detriment to all residents and the general area as well. There is no reason that Costco cannot design a façade to enhance the area and still be functional as a warehouse store.

We implore you to uphold the ambiance of the area and require Costco to build a structure suitable to the area.

Response to Comment No. 33-1

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade of the anchor retailer and streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 34

Laurel Francesca Greenstein
5160 Llano Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 34-1

I strongly oppose the ugly box-style Costco proposed for the above-referenced location. That eyesore does not fit with the promises to keep Warner Center an upscale “village”-type shopping center and neighborhood.

The only thing I can envision in keeping with the design of a concrete warehouse at the spot is a continuing line of protestors marching around it with picket signs.

If Costco is allowed to ruin our long-established neighborhood with a building designed for an industrial neighborhood, the only way to have our wishes respected will be to impact the warehouse/discount chain financially – for every employee they hire for the store, we will have three people picketing in front of it! When they have no profit from the destruction of our once-beautiful neighborhood, they will abandon the building.

In the long run, that will be good for the residents, because eventually our property values will go back up and ours will once again be a “nice” community – but in the meantime, it will be a negative situation for the city. It would be better if a compromise is reached wherein Costco builds an attractive building that fits with the existing tone of Woodland Hills.

I hope you will do your best to make that happen.

Response to Comment No. 34-1

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade of the anchor retailer and streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 35

Ron Guilbert
rongg@socal.rr.com

Comment No. 35-1

I think the idea of putting the proposed Costco store at the corner of Owensmouth and Victory in Woodland Hills is terrible and trust that the City will do the right thing for the City and the community by pulling the plug before it goes any further. It was a bad idea from the start and it's a bad-idea-made-worse now. I have copied Mr. Zine so he will hear another community voice opposing this plan.

Response to Comment No. 35-1

As part of Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, described in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, a previous site plan that included the anchor retailer parking structure along Victory Boulevard and the anchor retailer located internal to the site was discussed with the Department of Transportation and the Department of City Planning. Based on the design of the modified site plan, it was determined that this site plan would not provide the enhanced pedestrian accessibility and integration of uses offered by the project. In addition, the modified site plan would divide parking structures on the property with one structure located adjacent to Victory Boulevard and additional parking located internal to the project site, which does not provide readily accessible shared parking to service multiple retailers, increases unnecessary vehicular circulation within the site, and does not comply with the goals of the Proposed Draft Warner Center Specific Plan to locate parking structures internal to the site and to locate retail facilities along public street frontages.

With regard to other alternative site options that locate the anchor retailer internal to the site, the configuration of the property and the fact that adjacent portions on the southeast side are owned by another property owner precludes other potential building locations on the site for the size of the anchor retailer floor plate. For example, the anchor retailer cannot be located within the center of the site facing Victory Boulevard since portions of that land are owned by the adjoining property owner and are unavailable for development. Similarly, the placement of the existing Crate and Barrel and the existing two-story office building located at 6351 Owensmouth Avenue minimizes the site area available to accommodate the proposed large anchor retailer floor plate.

This comment regarding the proposed location of the anchor retailer is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 35-2

I was trying to think of what the proposed building reminds me of and I've decided that from the street it has all the beauty and charm of a county jail. Would that be a good use of the land? Think of it, a building wall more than 30' high running hard against the sidewalk for more than 400' along Victory Blvd.

Response to Comment No. 35-2

The project Applicant has a mixed commercial environment within the community by providing a variety of shopping and dining uses, office space, a hotel, community/cultural uses, and open space in order to provide an active shopping, dining, working, entertainment, and community experience for the Warner Center area. In response to comments from the community, refinements have been made to the original proposal including enhanced articulation to the anchor retailer building frontage along Victory Boulevard, meandering sidewalks and independent multi-use trails around the site's perimeter, complementary treatment to the parking structure façades and dedicated pedestrian pathways from Owensmouth Avenue. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade of the anchor retailer and streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard. In addition, the commercial uses proposed for the project site would be consistent with the existing land use designation and zoning for the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 35-3

It will, of course, be an irresistible target for the tagger gangs preying on the area. The City will have to make certain that the property owners clean the place up every morning. Maybe some watch towers and roving spot lights would help complete the picture.

Response to Comment No. 35-3

In order to address the potential for graffiti on any of the project buildings, Mitigation Measures A-6 and A-7 will be implemented to ensure that buildings remain free from graffiti. In addition, specific project design features that will be incorporated as part of the project in coordination with the LAPD include: on-site security to patrol the perimeter of the property, control and monitor activities in parking facilities and public spaces, and assist with patron access and monitor entrances and exits; an enhanced security program consisting of industry standard security lighting, closed-circuit television (CCTV) monitoring, and license plate recognition (LPR); a crime prevention design to ensure landscaping to be planted does not provide obvious cover for persons tampering with doors or windows or for persons lying in wait, lighting to reduce areas of concealment and provide pedestrian

orientation and to clearly identify a secure route, and design of public spaces and parking facilities to be easily patrolled and accessed by safety personnel.

Comment No. 35-4

Other reasons I oppose this bad-idea-made-worse plan include:

1. The building has no beauty. The site has been attractive and inviting until this came along. Why install this unattractive, distasteful structure to the Westfield property when so many other better options exist?

Response to Comment No. 35-4

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 35-5

2. A 24-bay gasoline station at the Owensmouth and Victory corner will have a very bad impact on both other vehicles and pedestrians trying to pass the location.

Response to Comment No. 35-5

The statement of a “24-bay gasoline station” is incorrect; the project proposes a 20-pump fueling station. While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project’s measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 35-6

a. There is no way to make a gasoline station attractive and meld in with otherwise good architecture.

Response to Comment No. 35-6

As described in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light, and Glare, and Shading, page 252, of the Draft EIR, the member-only fueling station would be screened from the public right-of-way with extensive landscaping and a landscaped screening wall to minimize the visibility of all the activities associated with fueling station operations, without

compromising safety and efficiency. Adjacent to both Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue, the project's landscaped setbacks would include a tree-lined meandering sidewalk and multi-use trail enhanced with shrubs, and a decorative vine covered screen wall that would obscure the fueling station activity beyond. In addition to the landscaping, pedestrian features and other amenities, such as seating areas and canopies, would surround the exterior of the member-only fueling station area to provide pedestrian linkages from Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5.

Comment No. 35-7

b. Double length gasoline tanker trucks making frequent deliveries to the site will tie up traffic.

Response to Comment No. 35-7

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fueling station's queuing.

Comment No. 35-8

c. Those wonderful gasoline tanks that "never" leak.

Response to Comment No. 35-8

Please refer to the Topical Response No. 4 for a detailed discussion on potential safety and environmental issues related to the fueling station.

Comment No. 35-9

d. Cars lined up in the street (blocking traffic) hoping to get the low-priced gasoline before the next fee increase. Have you seen how busy the Costco gasoline stations are?

Response to Comment No. 35-9

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fueling station's queuing.

Comment No. 35-10

e. Will there be room for RVs, busses, and other large vehicles at the station?

Response to Comment No. 35-10

The fueling station is designed to accommodate large vehicles both vertically and horizontally. The canopy is designed to provide a minimum of 14' of vertical clearance and each pump island is designed with a minimum 9' wide lane and an additional 10' wide access lane between each island. Large vehicles and RVs are expected to utilize and queue in the facility in the same manner as passenger vehicles.

Comment No. 35-11

f. The safety of pedestrians trying to walk past the station and dodging cars, trucks, and motorcycles as they move along. Consider those pedestrians who are handicapped and slow to move. Consider the temper of the drivers fighting to enter the fueling station and the department store. There is no good scenario in this scene.

Response to Comment No. 35-11

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project site's pedestrian connections. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 35-12

g. The addition of an always noisy and always dirty "tire installation center" to this fueling station for cars and trucks just adds to the ugliness and inappropriateness of the plan.

Response to Comment No. 35-12

As discussed in Section IV.F, Noise, pages 605-606, of the Draft EIR, noise impacts associated with the member-only tire installation center operations were found to be less than significant. In addition, the member-only tire installation center would be oriented internal to the site toward the new surface parking area to the south and would be obstructed from the residential areas across Owensmouth Avenue by the existing office building along Owensmouth Avenue.

Comment No. 35-13

3. The safety of pedestrians walking along the 400+ foot building wall is certainly a concern. Victory is a heavily trafficked street and should there be an incident, there is no escape for the pedestrians caught in this trap.

Response to Comment No. 35-13

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-11.

Comment No. 35-14

a. Why would anyone want to walk beside this wall anyway? Instead of being open and inviting to the community, the planned site closes off the existing views and traps people into a noisy half tunnel.

Response to Comment No. 35-14

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the anchor retail building's Victory Boulevard design and pedestrian orientation. Also, it is not clear what is meant by "half tunnel," but the overhead elements to be provided along the wall plane of the anchor retailer building along the Victory Boulevard frontage will be canopies and landscaping to provide shade and comfort for pedestrians.

Comment No. 35-15

4. Where will Costco put its trash? How many times a day will big trash trucks be entering and leaving the site? What will be the impact on surrounding traffic?

Response to Comment No. 35-15

The area immediately east of the anchor retailer would provide space for the proper disposal of refuse, loading of merchandise, and safe vehicular passage. Refuse from the anchor retailer would be collected in an enclosed space, as necessary, several times per week. This space would be screened from view. The trucks associated with refuse collection are accounted for in the trip-generation analysis conducted for the project and contained in the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 35-16

5. Is there room outside of the building to store hundreds of shopping carts? Are there locations in the parking lots to put these carts after customers have finished with them?

Response to Comment No. 35-16

Ample space will be provided for the storage of carts in the parking field and at the store entry. Several cart corrals will be placed in the parking field and will be staffed by the anchor retailer to capture empty carts and return them to the store entry.

Comment No. 35-17

6. Deliveries to Costco: This is a huge store with lots of products to sell. Not only will there be customers' cars, motorcycles, and trucks fighting for the closest parking slots, but Costco's delivery trucks will be pushing their way through these same roadways too.

Response to Comment No. 35-17

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's fuel truck deliveries. Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for additional information regarding the project's parking areas. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 35-18

7. There's an existing Costco a few miles to the north. It's ugly and should be seen as the model of how this structure will appear in a short time.

Response to Comment No. 35-18

The proposed Costco within the project site would not have a design that would be similar to the Costco at Roscoe Boulevard. Please refer to the graphics provided in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 5.

Comment No. 35-19

I'm not opposed to Costco in general; however, this is a bad idea with dangerous implications for the community. Let Costco find another location or just clean up its existing structure to the north and stay there.

Response to Comment No. 35-19

As discussed in detail in the Draft EIR, the project would not result in dangerous implications to the community. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 36

Jessica Hall
618 Vincent Park
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
jishica@mac.com

Comment No. 36-1

I am writing to express my hope that the City requires The Village developers to protect, restore and use the small drainage nicknamed Owensmouth Creek as a community resource as a condition of approving their development.

The Los Angeles region has lost over 90% of its waterways to development, including in the era of CEQA/NEPA. Mitigation has not left us with a “no net loss” of wetlands and riparian areas, despite the intent of the law. I hope the City acts congruently with its declarations in the Open Space Element of the General Plan and consistently with its recent Low Impact Development ordinance and the preamble of the Clean Water Act - to protect the chemical, physical and biological integrity of our waterways.

I do not know if this project is grandfathered in for LID compliance, but I would urge you to work with the developers to meet LID standards and incorporate this area into the plan.

Response to Comment No. 36-1

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-15 for a discussion of the drainage area in the northeast portion of the project site. The project will meet all applicable Low Impact Development (LID) standards.

Comment No. 36-2

A “village” that is acres of asphalt and no nature is a bit laughable, after all.

I have written about the subject briefly on the blog, LA Creek Freak.

Response to Comment No. 36-2

As described in further detail in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project would provide landscaped pedestrian walkways, landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas, and streetscape improvements along the project site’s perimeter. Approximately 263,800 square feet (6.05 acres) of landscape/hardscape open space areas

would be provided on the project site. Of this amount, approximately 50 percent of this open space (approximately 131,900 square feet) would be planted with ground cover, shrubs, or trees. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 37

G. Harry and Laura Hope
4733 San Feliciano Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
info@halastudios.com

Comment No. 37-1

Safety Issues

We would like to respond to the above mentioned DEIR on a few different levels. The first is **safety**. With safety in mind, we feel the gas station on the corner of Owensmouth and Victory would be very dangerous. Costco plans on having a (5) island gas station with (3) 30,000 gallon tanks underground totaling 90,000 gallons. As stated in the DEIR under the Geology and Soils Report on page 407, there is groundwater below the project site was encountered in exploratory borings at depths ranging between approximately 16 feet and 35 feet below ground surface. A huge issue with the underground tanks is there are vast amounts of gasoline tanks in the area that are leaking and are subject to groundwater contamination. Please see the following link contained in this paragraph from a letter dated 03/30/11 from Ken Matsuda, Sr. AQ Engineer, Refinery and Waste Management Permitting, Engineering and Compliance, South Coast Air Quality Management District.

“The State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (RWQCB) concern for groundwater contamination from leaking UST’s has led to the installation of groundwater monitoring wells at active and former gas stations throughout the Los Angeles region. According to reports about the site, there are approximately 20 wells at or near the sites mentioned above. There are no active groundwater production wells within 1 mile; however, groundwater monitoring and related soil boring investigations demonstrated the continuing presence of gasoline in the soil and shallow groundwater in the area, and specifically under the Shell station. Consequently, the RWQCB, in accordance with State law, requested a remedial action plan (RAP). For more information about the RWQCB with respect to this site, please use a web browser to find the following link:

<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=22330+Ventura+Blvd.%2C+Woodland+Hills%2C+CA>.

Wayne Perry, Inc., a consultant for Equilon Enterprises LLC, prepared and submitted a RAP last August, 2010. In addition, in December 2010, they submitted the application for permit to construct and operate a soil vapor extraction and treatment system. The District has no affiliation with the permit applicant, Equilon, or Wayne Perry.”

The above quote was from a letter emailed to us in regards [sic] to the AQMD setting a gas station on fire at 22330 Ventura Blvd., Woodland Hills, CA 91364, to burn off excess gasoline leakage that could not be cleaned up through other extraction methods. We feel the gas station should be eliminated in it's [sic] entirety. There is not just the groundwater issue in this area, but also the liquification factor of the alluvium and silt that is in this area on which they are building. There are also issues with earthquakes when they are building parking structures and buildings with such magnitude with no mention of how they are going to stabilize the foundations.

Response to Comment No. 37-1

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a discussion on the groundwater levels at the location of the fueling station and the safety measures and seismic standards that would be implemented at the fueling station. As discussed in the Draft EIR, as with any new development in the State of California, the project is required to be built in conformance with the latest seismic standards of the California Building Code and Los Angeles Municipal Code. Project Design Feature C.1 requires that "Project building design and construction would conform to the most current building and seismic safety design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Municipal Code." The project also includes a number of project design features and mitigation measures that would ensure that impacts associated with seismic events would be less than significant.

Comment No. 37-2

Another safety issue we are concerned about is crime. There are many areas within the proposed Village at Westfield Topanga proposal that even though they are showing that the walkable areas will be lit, they are pretty secluded should a person be attacked. There is no place showing for people to be able to duck into for help. To alleviate this problem, they should locate active use retail and restaurants at the street level. They should also make the paths and nodes more discernable. When Westfield was asked by the community and the Neighborhood Council PLUM committee if they would consider this, their answer was a flat "NO". [sic] There are also graffiti factors for the very large and very blank walls. I've seen the Costco on Roscoe Blvd. near Canoga. Costco does NOT maintain the integrity of the buildings nor the community.

Response to Comment No. 37-2

As described in Section IV.G.2, Public Services – Police Protection, of the Draft EIR, the project would incorporate several project design features and would implement mitigation measures to ensure on-site security and a crime prevention design in order to maintain high levels of safety for employees, patrons, and visitors. These project design features include on-site security to patrol the perimeter of the property, control and monitor

activities in parking facilities and public spaces, and assist with patron access and monitor entrances and exits; an enhanced security program consisting of industry standard security lighting, closed-circuit television (CCTV) monitoring, and license plate recognition (LPR); and a crime prevention design to ensure landscaping to be planted does not provide obvious cover for persons tampering with doors or windows or for persons lying in wait, lighting to reduce areas of concealment and provide pedestrian orientation and to clearly identify a secure route, and design of public spaces and parking facilities to be easily patrolled and accessed by safety personnel. In addition, in order to address the potential for graffiti on any of the project buildings, Mitigation Measures A-6 and A-7 would be implemented to ensure that buildings remain graffiti-free. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the design of the project.

Comment No. 37-3

Community Issues

There are guidelines from the existing Warner Center Specific Plan that should apply to this project and **are not** being considered.

1. ***The Owensmouth Parkway*** - This area is defined as “The area along Owensmouth Avenue between Van Owen Street on the north and Ventura Freeway on the south.” Some of the noted objectives in the Specific Plan for this area are, “Establish a street that encourages pedestrian use by promoting pedestrian serving activities.” And “Coordinate [sic] the design of Owensmouth Avenue so that the existing and future transportation requirements are addressed in a creative, functional and aesthetically pleasing manner.”

The Specific Plan goes on to state “activities and spaces.....should be street oriented rather than internally focused within a development.” The proposed plan is anything but.

Response to Comment No. 37-3

Refer to Response to Comment No. 17-17 regarding the project’s consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines included in Appendix E of the Warner Center Specific Plan. Also refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding how the project has been designed to be pedestrian-oriented.

Comment No. 37-4

2. ***Articulation of Building Facades*** - The specific plan requires buildings more than 250’ long to be relieved by one or more variations as seen in the plan view that is more than 15’ in depth. The specific plan states “The building facades of parking structures should be

designed to be compatible in color, material, and architectural detail with the buildings it serves.” The facades of the retail structures have varied materials, openings, and parapet heights that need to be brought into the design of the parking structures to meet this requirement.

Response to Comment No. 37-4

As discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project would be substantially consistent with these Specific Plan requirements addressing building façade articulation. Refer to Response to Comment No. 18-14 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade of the proposed parking structure.

Comment No. 37-5

3. ***Minimum Setbacks*** - The minimum setback along Victory Blvd. and Erwin is 25’ from the property line. These setbacks will not be met by the current proposed elevation. Consideration of the **exemption from the plan has not been formally requested.**

Response to Comment No. 37-5

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project’s consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 37-6

4. ***Automobile and/or Truck Sales, New and Used*** - These functions are prohibited in the Specific Plan. The applicant is requesting an **exemption** to this.

Response to Comment No. 37-6

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-33 for a discussion of the consistency of the project’s uses with those permitted by the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 37-7

We would like to see the Costco do something other than the “BIG BOX” design. While Costco maintains that the BIG BOX is their design and they don’t want to spend the money on it, they can and have deviated from that design (or the lack thereof). Please see the link

http://www.nharchitecture.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=498&Itemid=498 for the Costco in Australia [sic]

Costco_Melbourne

[Image]

and this is the Costco in Henderson, Nevada

800px-Costcostorehenderson

[image]

As you can see by these photos, the buildings don't have to be the BIG BOX. When Westfield was asked various questions like:

Can you break up the parking structure into smaller buildings - **NO**

Can you reduce the footprint of the building by making it a multiple story - **NO**

Can you move the Costco building away from Victory Blvd. - **NO**

Can you move some of the Costco departments that can be located on the exterior walls so that windows could be introduced on the lower portions of the building - **NO**

...etc. Westfield said **NO**

We don't understand why we as homeowners in this area must abide by the rules and guidelines but then the developers come in to this area where they don't even live and can say NO, NO, NO to all the communities [sic] concerns and can build a (pardon the expression) a piece of "crap" building that we all have to live with! They are not even trying to compromise on the issues. They have relented in other areas as to the BIX [sic] BOX design. Why not ours?

Response to Comment No. 37-7

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-2 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the proposed project. Also refer to Response to Comment No. 28-2.

Comment No. 37-8

Financial Impacts

There are some tax credit issues that desperately need addressing:

- Please provide detailed information regarding the impact of thee [sic] \$37,400 tax credit for each employee hired and how it applies to Westfield and Costco [sic]
- With the 35% reduction on utilities from DWP (discounts), please explain how the DWP will account for the substantial loss of revenue and the impacts to services required for the community [sic]
- What is the monetary benefit to Westfield and their future tenants for using of [sic] the privilege of priority bidding on state contracts?
- How much money will be saved by Westfield and their tenants when site plan review fees are waived?
- With reduced parking space requirements, where will the overflow vehicles go? Regarding the tax credits to be used for buying machinery and equipment - does this mean fewer taxes are paid so less revenue is available for the needs of the community?
- WITH ALL THE MONEY THAT IS BEING SAVED AND GIVEN BACK TO WESTFIELD, WHY ARE THEY **NOT** GIVING BACK TO THE COMMUNITY????
???

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Response to Comment No. 37-8

The Applicant's website is not associated with the environmental review process being conducted by the City of Los Angeles for the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 38

Ezra Horne
ezrahorne@gmail.com

Comment No. 38-1

We need to stop this continuing process of culverting and piping every creek and ditch in LA. It increases pollution and depletes groundwater stores as water cannot seep through the earth.

From LACreekFreak

(<http://lacreekfreak.wordpress.com/2011/03/28/another-creek-faces-the-pipe-san-fernando-valley-edition/>)

“Channel? Bed? Banks? Sediment? Water (including seasonal)? Direction of Flow?”

Looks like we’ve got a stream that meets the City’s definition. So why again is this small edge of the property being piped and paved, not set aside as a public park, or dare we suggest, part of the Low Impact Development/stormwater mitigation plan?”

Please don’t allow the Westfield development to bury our streams and creeks!

Response to Comment No. 38-1

The area described by the Commentor is a man-made drainage swale that is primarily lined with asphalt concrete, located on the northeast portion of the project site. This area was excavated on dry land for flood control purposes, and the City of Los Angeles labels this area as a storm drain. This area has not been designated as a “creek” by the City of Los Angeles, or any regional or State agency. The drainage swale conveys rainwater runoff flows collected from Owensmouth Avenue and the surface parking on-site, to a storm drain inlet along Victory Boulevard. This storm drain system that serves the project site and the watershed within which the project site is located eventually discharges into the Los Angeles River.

Improvements to the corner of Victory Boulevard at Owensmouth will result in a landscaped sidewalk and corner plaza with shade structures, bermed landscaping, mature shade trees, and meandering sidewalks. Any stormwater currently collected in the box culvert leading under Victory Boulevard will be collected in accordance with National

Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans, and Low Impact Development standards and requirements.

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-15 for a discussion of the drainage area in the northeast portion of the project site.

Comment Letter No. 39

Liz H.
18345 Schoolcraft St.
Reseda, CA 91335
eekitsdamouse@aol.com

Comment No. 39-1

The Topanga/Westfield Villgace [sic] /Costco project as it is currently planned is a huge mistake. No one has listened to the concerns of the community. The traffic is horrible and I am sure there will be a lot more noise.

This proposal as it stands like [sic] it is, is destructive to the community. Do some studies on the effect it will have.

A 450 foot X 375 foot on [sic] stop warehouse plopped down right on Victory Blvd . [sic] What an eye sore [sic] to drive by on a daily basis. Cute, smaller stores should line Victory Blvd [sic]

This is sad, we as a community were promised a Farmers Market/ The Grove, and this is what we get?

The least you can do is move everything back from the street 100 [sic] from the street to keep down the visual blight. Please try to make Topanga Westfield to [sic] improve the Village project for the community.

Blight and traffic need to be lessened, not promoted.

Response to Comment No. 39-1

Please refer to Sections IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading; IV.F, Noise; and IV.H, Traffic, Access and Parking, of the Draft EIR for detailed analysis of the potential aesthetics, noise, and traffic impacts, respectively, associated with the project. Also refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project, including the streetscape and landscape improvements that would be introduced along Victory Boulevard. The 100-foot building setback from Victory Boulevard suggested by the Commentor would not provide a layout that could accommodate the proposed building footprints and parking areas while providing integrated publicly accessible open space areas and pedestrian paths. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 40

Robin C. Jaffe, AIA
Jaffe Design Group
5301 Topeka Dr.
Tarzana, CA 91356

Comment No. 40-1

We like Costco. We just don't think the proposed location is good for Warner Center.

Response to Comment No. 40-1

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 40-2

What we don't like about the current proposal is:

The streetscape along Victory Blvd. will become very oppressive. It will not have the walkability that the general plan suggests as a goal for all urban development. Anyone walking along the block from Topanga to Owensmouth will encounter two very significant driveways and a four hundred foot long wall as tall as a typical three story building adjacent to the sidewalk. That is longer than a football field. The good part of this is that they would be shaded by the wall during the summertime. Costco typically does nothing to their walls to make them attractive or give any relief to the monotony of the mass. Perhaps if the entire wall were a civic experience, we would feel differently. If the wall had a park like space between it and Victory Boulevard, at least 30' wide, with a gracious sidewalk, not necessarily made of concrete, meandering rather than straight, with seating benches and nice landscaping along the way, with ceramic tile murals as art, decorating the wall to make walking along there interesting, and some of the landscaping very tall trees, some arbors, some chess tables, etc. Perhaps then, I would even want to go there and thank Costco for making such a place but just a sidewalk with a row of trees doesn't cut it.

Response to Comment No. 40-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the building façade and streetscape along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 40-3

Costco is a destination store but not really an anchor because everyone must drive there to be able to carry the bulk of items purchased home. They don't stick around to shop anywhere else because they are tired and may have perishable items to get home. It is really not a store that brings people to shop at any other store. Because some of the parking will be in a parking structure, there will need to be a pick up [sic] area for people to get purchases to their cars unless there is a convenient large elevator in the parking structure close to the Costco entrance.. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 40-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion of Costco as a potential anchor tenant for the project. Surface parking is proposed to be located next to the anchor building, which would avoid the need for customers to use elevators in a parking structure when leaving the anchor building. Costco does not propose to reserve the ground level of the parking structure for its use.

Comment No. 40-4

Because Costco is a vehicle oriented store, it wastes its proximity to the transportation hub on Owensmouth. Ideally the function that goes here would be something that people would be able to take public transportation to such as an event center, museum, etc. as long as the transportation is reliable late into the night. The current proposal blocks direct access to the transportation hub by inserting vehicle uses instead.

Response to Comment No. 40-4

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project site's pedestrian connections to public transit.

Comment No. 40-5

The current proposal does not include any tram type transportation between the transportation hub and the Promenade Mall on the south, the Topanga mall on the north and the proposed project between the two malls. In the proposed plan, shoppers will have to get into their car and drive to the next mall to shop there or walk a very long distance. This project, since it is all developed by the same company, should have reliable, Westfield tram service throughout.

Response to Comment No. 40-5

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-2 for a discussion of a sub-regional shuttle.

Comment No. 40-6

This Costco site does not seem to have enough space for typical Costco operations. Additionally, wherever they put the back of store operations will be in some other property owners [sic] view space. This is never done at other Costco locations and is not a neighborly thing to do. Costco will need gasoline tankers to deliver gasoline three times every day because of the limited storage ability. They also need large semi-truck trailers to make most deliveries every day of products for the store. Additionally they will have one delivery at 9pm and 7-12 deliveries between 1am and 10am. They also need a place to dump trash and store unneeded store fixtures or whatever it is that won't fit on their sales floor. The current proposed site layout does not provide adequate space for these functions.

Response to Comment No. 40-6

The area immediately east of the anchor tenant allows for the proper disposal of refuse, loading of merchandise and safe vehicular passage. This area of the anchor retailer is consistent with the prototypical building layout and would be screened from view. Wooden pallets will be stored for pick up within the store and in exterior areas screened from view. Refuse from the anchor retailer would be collected as necessary several times per week.

Comment No. 40-7

In the San Fernando Valley, other Costco stores utilize more area than is allocated to the Warner Center store but the store itself will be the same size. The Van Nuys store has about 13 ½ acres, Pacoima store about 10 ½ acres, the Northridge store about 15 acres, and the Warner Center store will utilize about 9 acres. Where the plans appear to be lacking is in the loading area and the back of store/storage & trash areas. On grade parking is dramatically reduced from the typical Costco but is being compensated for by parking structures. The lack of servicing areas is worrisome. There is no room along Victory to provide those functions because the structure is so close to the sidewalk. Perhaps they will try to put this on the west side which is the primary entrance to the entire development. That would detract even further from the appearance of the project. It just seems that the space is too small for Costco. Maybe they plan on trucks waiting for loading space along Victory. If the store were two stories, a solution not desired by Costco, they would gain back about 1 ½ acres which would be enough to handle the loading and

storage areas and cut down on the length of the massive wall along Victory, even though it would be taller.

Response to Comment No. 40-7

As the central parking structure may also be used by patrons of the anchor retailer, the large surface parking area typically provided by anchor retailers is not necessary at the project site, resulting in a small decrease in land area relative to other anchor retail stores. Additionally, the loading area for the anchor retailer is consistent with the prototypical building layout and is located on the southeast corner of the anchor retail building. The loading area is designed so that no trucks will queue on City streets. In addition, an alternative project site plan with a two-story anchor retailer was analyzed as part of Alternative F: Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. This alternative project site plan was determined to have greater impacts with regard to Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Light, Shading, Land Use Consistency, Parking, and Access. The alternatives analysis also determined that the alternative project design with a two-story anchor retailer would not meet several Project Objectives. As discussed in this section, many large-format retailers do not successfully operate on multiple levels, thus making it difficult to attract a tenant for this site design. Furthermore, Objective 5 would not be attained by a two-story anchor retailer. This objective is to utilize the project site's large undeveloped and underdeveloped assemblage of parcels to accommodate a large floor plate, single-level anchor retailer. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the anchor retailer's proposed design.

Comment No. 40-8

Other EIR comments: Page 481 states that most buildings in the first phase will be generally comprised of two stories with heights up to 100.' [sic] I can't imagine any two story [sic] building, even with signs, being nearly 100.' [sic]

Response to Comment No. 40-8

As shown in the elevations provided in Figures IV.A-12 through IV.A-15 in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, buildings to be developed during Phase 1 would be below 100 feet but would feature design and identification elements, i.e., signage, that could be up to 100 feet.

Comment Letter No. 41

Paul Land and Barbara Magnusson Land
22100 Viscanio Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 41-1

As residents of Woodland Hills for twenty years, we would like to submit our comments on the above referenced project. Originally, "The Village at Westfield Topanga" was proposed as a pedestrian friendly, aesthetically pleasing concept with upscale retailers and restaurants, a hotel and apartments, and one or more cultural venues. The acceptance of Costco into the mix has degraded that plan. The standard "big box" style building, along with a giant 20 pump gas station, tire center and auto sales, has been proposed. This is not an industrial area, and it shouldn't look like one. People gravitate to open, pedestrian friendly and architecturally detailed "town center" type places. Costco's interesting, modern structure in Melbourne, Australia proves that they have come up with different ways to go design wise besides a large, ugly shed surrounded by a sea of concrete for parking.

Response to Comment No. 41-1

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's design, including the design of the anchor retail building.

Comment No. 41-2

In addition, you would think that such a massive construction in the middle of the Warner Center would generate plenty of new jobs for the community (300 were touted at Costco alone) and much needed tax and fee income for the area, but that doesn't seem to be the case. Instead, it appears that 200+ employees will be moving from the Canoga Park Costco to the new location, and the City and the D.W.P. are bending over backwards to give tax incentives, fee waivers and price breaks to the developer. The result? A few new jobs and less revenue will be available for the needs of the community. Is the city giving too much, incentive-wise, to the developer and anchor tenant, at the expense of the neighborhood?

Response to Comment No. 41-2

Assuming that the anchor retailer is Costco, the sales tax revenue that will be generated for the City of Los Angeles by the uses at the project include sales tax from the Costco (whatever the net result is from any closure of the existing Costco), and also from the Westfield retail, and retail and dining uses in the project's proposed hotel and office

building. Other categories of tax revenues from these uses include the City's share of the property tax, in-lieu Motor Vehicle License Fee revenue (an add-on to the property tax), utility user's tax, business license tax, parking tax revenue, and transient occupancy (i.e., hotel room) tax.

At the time the Draft EIR was prepared, no decision had been reached by Costco about the status of its existing store in the project vicinity. However, as described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, operation of the anchor retailer is expected to generate approximately 350 employees, and, upon full buildout of the project, up to 2,687 on-site employees would be generated. If Costco relocates to the project site, approximately 200 employees would relocate, resulting in approximately 150 net new employees to be generated by the new anchor retailer at the project site.

The City and the Applicant have not yet determined the incentives that will be provided to the project as permitted within the Enterprise Zone; however, such determinations are policy decisions of the City of Los Angeles, consistent with State law, and do not alter the Draft EIR's analysis of the project's environmental impacts under CEQA.

Please also refer to Response to Comment No. 19-32 for a discussion of the State's designation of Warner Center as an enterprise zone and the economic output, job creation, and tax revenues that will be generated by the project.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 41-3

We are the ones that will have to live with the development over the next decades and its additional traffic, noise, lighting and drain on public services like the D.W.P. We need some "incentives" to support this project, too.

Response to Comment No. 41-3

As discussed in the Draft EIR, operation of the project would result in less than significant impacts associated with light, operational noise, and public utilities. (Refer to Sections IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, IV.F, Noise, and IV.I, Utilities, of the Draft EIR). As discussed in Section IV.H, Traffic, traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

In addition, the project is fulfilling the City's policy objectives for the Enterprise Zone, by generating approximately \$533 million dollars of economic activity from development and construction of the project, and approximately \$648 million of economic activity from operation of the project. The project will generate approximately 3,000 construction and construction-related jobs, and approximately 2,687 on-site jobs. The project will generate approximately \$8.1 million each year in tax revenues to the City of Los Angeles. The project will also make payments to LADWP.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 41-4

Our Neighborhood Council and their PLUM Committee have been working very hard with Westfield and Costco over the past year, attempting to arrive at something more in tune with the community's needs and expectations, but have found Westfield and Costco to be quite inflexible. The neighborhood would like its voice to be heard. On a development of this nature, something that will impact our lives so significantly, our input should be considered significant.

Response to Comment No. 41-4

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-2 regarding the opportunities for public input.

Comment Letter No. 42

Clifford Latimer, MPSE
clifflat@gmail.com
latimer@usc.edu

Comment No. 42-1

How about a park at Owensmouth Creek?

Response to Comment No. 42-1

The project site is designated for Regional Commercial land uses and the project's proposed commercial uses would be consistent with this designation. In addition, the proposed project does not include residential uses that would generate a direct demand for parks and recreational space. Nonetheless, the project would provide landscaped pedestrian walkways with publicly accessible landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas, and streetscape improvements along the project site's perimeter that would include features such as landscaped pedestrian paths, new multi-use trails, new and enhanced transit stops and mini-plaza areas at the corners of the project site extra space. Such improvements would create an active, pedestrian-friendly environment that would enhance the visual character of the site and surrounding streetscape.

Comment Letter No. 43

Aaron Levinson
23390 Erwin St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
aaron@levinsonhouse.com

Comment No. 43-1

Most people only raise their voices when they have a complaint or concern; few people do so to offer support. I feel it is important to show my support of The Village at Westfield Topanga.

I am a 14-year resident of Woodland Hills. My wife works in one of the stores at Westfield Topanga. We visit Westfield Promenade several times a month as well and we drive by the proposed site of The Village daily.

I am saddened that some of my neighbors are against this project, though I do believe the silent majority are in favor of it. The current state of the property is not acceptable the way it is. I feel that the proposed project will bring jobs and excitement to the area, as well as potentially raise property values of the surrounding neighborhoods. Further, I believe that Westfield is in this "game" for the long term; they will not simply upgrade the site and walk away. They want to make this work, which means they will make the improvements to the roads and traffic necessary for shoppers, workers and visitors to utilize the site properly.

Westfield has done incredible work on the existing two malls in the neighborhood. I look forward to seeing and visiting The Village when it is complete.

I hope the City of Los Angeles will give this project the proper consideration it deserves and will ultimately support it.

Response to Comment No. 43-1

This comment expresses support for the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 44

Martin Lipkin
6153 County Oak Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 44-1

I have reviewed significant portions of the 9-volume Draft EIR for the Village at Westfield Topanga and have found a significant number of errors, omissions and simply incorrect facts [sic] that dramatically impact the veracity and thoroughness of the entire report and the effect it will have upon residents of Woodland Hills, the west San Fernando Valley area, and the city of Los Angeles.

In a number of areas, many important environmental conditions have simply been ignored, and the proposal's failure to address existing Warner Center Specific Plan rules and guidelines is astonishing.

I have seen several other submissions responding to this Draft EIR and many of them already address these problems, so I will not reiterate them. However, I believe the following issues require additional answers, corrections and clarification from Westfield, Costco and the City of Los Angeles Planning Department before the first spade of dirt is ever turned on this project.

Response to Comment No. 44-1

The Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been completed in accordance with CEQA requirements. Potential impacts are based on the significance thresholds and methodologies set forth within the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, each of the comments on the Draft EIR have been responded to as part of this Final EIR. Refer to Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR for a detailed discussion of the project's consistency with the existing Warner Center Specific Plan. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 44-2

1. **430 ft. "Wall" along Victory Blvd.:** Placing the proposed Costco building approximately 20 feet from the Victory Boulevard curb and facing it inward toward the project (South facing) creates a solid 430 ft. "wall" along the majority of the property's northern boundary. Visual relief is minimal and creates a major barrier for pedestrians—

undermining the “walkability factor” that has been stressed by both Westfield and the current Warner Center Specific Plan.

- Why can't the Costco building be sited to the rear of the proposed lot with the front entrance facing Victory?
- Why must the proposed location of the Costco building be positioned only 25-feet [sic] from the pedestrian sidewalk and bike paths along Victory Blvd.?
- Why do the two proposed “towers” at the east and west ends of this back all intrude into space that is considered “dedicated” by the City of Los Angeles?
- Why must there be an unbroken wall of 430-feet? [sic] Why can't an additional center “tower” structure be created to break up he [sic] visual massing of this wall?
- Why are there no windows within this 430-ft [sic] wall to visually break up the massing [sic] of this 35-ft. tall “wall?”

Response to Comment No. 44-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 regarding the anchor retailer's design along Victory Boulevard. Please also refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for additional information regarding the project's setback requirements. With respect to alternative site configurations, please refer to Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, for the Draft EIR's analysis of alternative site plans.

Comment No. 44-3

2. Trash and waste areas for Costco have not been adequately addressed.

Because the Westfield proposal projects automotive and pedestrian traffic along both the west and east sides of Costco, there has been inadequate planning for the storage of trash, paper recycling materials, food waste and wooden pallets. At every Costco store of a similar configuration, there is a large “waste area” out of view of the general public and vehicular traffic where waste materials are stored and made ready for pick up. There is only one small area for all of these waste and recycling materials indicated on the plans proposed. Inadequate disposal storage for meat, fat, vegetable and other perishable grocery waste will mean serious problems in vermin control, bacteria and flies that will impact Costco as well as two restaurants (Paninni and Zen Buffet) located in the shopping mall across the street. Lack of adequate storage will create visual eyesores of wood pallets and bales of compressed cardboard and paper products awaiting pickup.

Additionally, the proposed location for the waste bins will create significant safety problems for vehicles entering and exiting the driveway immediately to the east of the proposed Costco store as trash trucks utilize part of the driveway to load waste materials. When this problem was pointed out to the two lead Westfield executives in a meeting at their [sic] offices, both stated, "They haven't solved that problem yet." As of the filing date of this Draft EIR, those waste and storage area problems have still gone unsolved and unanswered.

- Where will wooden pallets [sic] be stored so they will not be seen by the general public or accessed by children or teens—possibly become a safety hazard?
- How will vermin be prevented from accessing or breeding in or near the meat/fat/vegetable or grocery waste that is proposed to be stored on the east side of the Costco building?
- Will waste materials, garbage and recycling materials (paper/cardboard) be stored inside the Costco facility if there is not sufficient storage available in the proposed waste area compound? If not, where will excess waste materials be stored? For what duration? How will rodents be controlled around this proposed area?
- What controls will be in place to fight the proliferation of flies and fruit flies when there is fresh produce waste?
- Where will trash/waste disposal trucks park in order to pick up refuse without impacting traffic flow into and out of the proposed gas station location?
- How will Costco handle traffic mitigation when a trash truck blocks access into or out of the eastern driveway on Victory Blvd.?
- Where will larger trash items be stored for pick-up? (air conditioner units/ refrigeration cases/ electric and plumbing parts/ etc.)

Response to Comment No. 44-3

The area immediately east of the anchor tenant allows for the proper disposal of refuse, loading of merchandise and safe vehicular passage. All tenants must adhere to federal, state, and local sanitary requirements that protect personal safety and minimize vermin intrusions. Wooden pallets will be stored for pick up within the store and in exterior areas screened from view. Refuse from the anchor retailer would be collected as necessary several times per week.

The two truck loading bays for trash pick-up are standard for a tenant of this size and will facilitate the efficient loading and unloading of merchandise away from pedestrian corridors and active retail areas. The trucks associated with refuse collection are accounted for in the trip generation analysis conducted in the Draft EIR for the project.

Comment No. 44-4

3. Gas storage tanks placed directly on top of sensitive ground water area: The proposal to place three (3) 30,000 [sic] gallon gasoline tanks on an area that currently has a natural creek spring bed below it that flows directly into the headwaters of the LA River imperils a natural resource that is being restored. There are no “safety vaults” for these tanks to prevent environmental disasters in case of tank leaks, over-filling or earthquake damage. We have seen how an earthquake can severely compromise tanks containing liquids (Japanese reactor cooling tanks) and allow the escape of potentially hazardous liquids and materials into the water table. As currently proposed, all gasoline spillage would be absorbed into the water table and make its way to the origin of the LA River a short distance away. An accident or natural disaster could produce enormous environmental consequences and pose a significant health and safety threat to the entire San Fernando Valley, and quite possibly to the majority of the City of Los Angeles and Santa Monica Bay.

- What additional safety precautions outside of double-walling the gasoline storage tanks are being proposed to prevent gas leaks or tank failure from contaminating the area and the ground water?
- Why can't a concrete “sarcophagus” be built around the fuel tanks and lined with an impermeable membrane to protect against any possible leaks, spillages or tank/pipeline breaks?
- Why must the proposed gas station be located on this critical corner? Why can [sic] the location of the gas station and the fuel tanks be moved to the area for the proposed “flat parking lot” for Costco?
- What other ways is Costco proposing to mitigate gasoline from entering the water table and possibly reaching the headwaters of the LA River?

Response to Comment No. 44-4

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding the safety measures associated with the fueling station and underground storage tanks, and additional information regarding the groundwater levels in the location of the fuel station.

As discussed in Response to Comment No. 19-15, the area described by the Commentor is a man-made drainage swale that is primarily lined with asphalt concrete, located on the northeast portion of the project site. This area was excavated on dry land for flood control purposes, and the City of Los Angeles labels this area as a storm drain.¹¹ This area has not been designated as a “creek” by the City of Los Angeles, or any regional or state agency. This drainage area only temporarily contains water and does not provide any substantial resource value for wildlife, nor does it contain any substantial vegetation, nor the functions and values associated with a typical streambed.¹² The drainage swale conveys rainwater runoff flows, collected from Owensmouth Avenue and surface parking on site, to an inlet along Victory Boulevard. This storm drain system that serves the project site and the watershed within which the project site is located eventually discharges into the Los Angeles River.

Comment No. 44-5

4. Costco gas tank reservoirs refueling area creates dangers for motorists and delivery personnel: Costco proposes to place their refueling access ports in the driveway along the eastern border between their store and their gas station—a dangerous and sensitive location. As indicated in their submitted plans, this is a relatively tight driveway area that will be heavily used by motorists both entering and exiting the property with the intent of either parking at Costco or utilizing the Costco gas station pumps. As proposed, there is an insufficient amount of turning or passing space for motorists turning into the property from Victory and a tanker truck refueling the tanks. This problem will be exacerbated if this area is also used for storage of cardboard bales or wooden pallets that is adjacent to the undersized proposed storage/waste compound. Possible hazards caused by this poorly thought out tank refueling location include a major spill of fuel (immediate access to the LA River) or a fire from a car colliding with a fuel truck. Also, there will be a significant impact on traffic traveling east along Victory Blvd.—a major artery through the West Valley—as cars back up waiting for room to pass the refueling tanker.

- Why can't the tank refueling ports be located in an area that won't impact traffic coming into or out of the eastern-most Costco driveway?
- Why can't the gas station be relocated to the southern boundary of the Costco site to alleviate the traffic problems?

¹¹ 1962 City of Los Angeles drawing with title “PLAN AND PROFILE OF STORM DRAIN WEST OF OWENSMOUTH AVENUE FROM STA. 22+00 TO STA. 33+00” (Sheet No. 8 of 12)

¹² Owensmouth and Victory Storm Runoff Feature Memorandum. LSA and Associates, June 16, 2011.

- Why isn't there a dedicated refueling site that is not directly adjacent to the Costco driveway?
- Why isn't there sufficient room for refueling trucks entering and exiting the easternmost Costco driveway off Victory to swing into a refueling position without impacting traffic on Victory or traffic in the Costco driveway?
- What happens to traffic if a refueling tank truck parks at an angle and makes one of the driveway lanes unusable while it is off-loading fuel?
- What safety precautions are being made to protect motorists fueling up at the adjacent gas station, if a tanker truck should catch on fire or explode?
- What delivery time restraints are being imposed on truckers bringing in gas, s [sic] that their deliveries do not impact on traffic flow either along Victory Blvd., or into and out of the eastern most Costco driveway?

Response to Comment No. 44-5

As described in Topical Response No. 2, access to the fueling station storage tanks is located outside of the fueling station area where waiting vehicles will queue. It will be located along the western edge of the fueling station canopy. Fuel trucks would not impede access into and out of the fueling station. There is no evidence to suggest that relocation of the fueling station to the southern portion of the project site would further reduce traffic impacts. The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project. The proposed mitigations would reduce the impacts at adjacent intersections to less than significant levels.

The most optimal condition for refueling activities to occur is for the refueling site to be in close proximity to the underground fuel storage tanks. Operational and logistical issues may arise by separating the refueling site from the underground fuel storage tanks. These issues may include, but are not limited to, installation of additional pipeline equipment linking the sites and identifying a suitable location on-site for remote refueling. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding the safety measures that would be implemented as part of the fueling station.

As described in Topical Response No. 2, depending upon the types of vehicles used for deliveries and the time of day, larger trucks may require use of the two far right lanes of Victory Boulevard to exit the site. However, any disruptions to through traffic are anticipated to be minimal and similar to the disruption of a bus leaving a stop. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding queuing and access associated with the fueling station.

Comment No. 44-6

5. Inadequate delivery truck access for Costco and its gas station: Based on the plans in the EIR, there is inadequate access and turning space into both the Costco store and the gas refueling area for semi-trailer trucks. The majority of truck deliveries (estimated at 7-12 for the store and 3 for the gas station daily) would have to gain entry to the Costco loading dock and the Costco refueling point from either the eastern-most entry on Victory or the two entrances on Owensmouth. All three access points present critical safety and traffic problems. Owensmouth is not wide enough to permit a 40-foot trailer to safely swing into the parking area without severely impacting traffic flow along this key corridor route. In addition, if a large truck should gain entry from Owensmouth, there is insufficient room indicated in the lot area adjacent to the loading docks to allow 7-12 large trucks the space to maneuver past parking cars, incoming traffic and pedestrians safely. Entry from the Victory point would have major impact on traffic along Victory Bl. As the radius of the truck turns would effectively block two lanes of traffic. If waiting motorist [sic] create a blockage at this point (key shopping days) then trucks may be blocking traffic, along Victory and turns onto Owensmouth for a substantial amount of time. Also, if a fuel truck is filling a tank, access by another semi-trailer would be impeded and could lead to dangers for both truckers and motorists in the Costco lot.

- How will Costco modify this truck access problem?
- Why can't a lane of parking spaces in the Costco lot be eliminated to widen the turning space for delivery and trash trucks?
- Why won't large delivery trucks entering from one of the Owensmouth driveways back up traffic on Owensmouth while it tries to make the tight turn onto the property. [sic] Owensmouh [sic] is only a 2-lan [sic] street and the "swing factor" for semi trucks will cause trucks to block both lanes of traffic. Motorists trying to pass a truck making a right hand turn could crash into the truck.
- Will all delivery trucks be restricted to making a right-hand turn out of the Costco lot? If allowed a left turn exiting the Costco lot, how can a semi-truck escape from blocking traffic on Victory Blvd.?
- What steps are being taken to protect pedestrians (and shoppers) in the Costco parking area from being hit by a turning semi-truck, or from being impeded by a turning/parking semi-truck?
- Will there be traffic back ups [sic] from semi-trucks trying to negotiate the tight turns off Owensmouth and having to wait for cars and shoppers who are preventing access through the Costco parking lot to the loading platforms?

- What safety precautions are being taken to mitigate the problems of two semi-trucks colliding in the Costco lot?
- How will traffic be mitigated if a bus is downloading passengers on Owensmouth, and a semi-truck is blocking the turning lane?
- Where will trucks queue up if all of the loading bays are filled at Costco? Will they queue in the Costco parking lot? Where? Will they [sic] be forced to queue along Owensmouth? Where?
- Where will deliver [sic] trucks queue up for deliveries at the other retail locations within the proposed Village property (No loading platforms are indicated in the submitted plans). [sic]

Response to Comment No. 44-6

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's fuel truck deliveries. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

The bus stop location on Owensmouth Avenue, south of Victory Boulevard is within a 325' long auxiliary lane; the final location of the bus stop is likely towards Victory Boulevard. This will leave sufficient room for the co-location of the bus stop and right-turn lane, in the unlikely event of a truck waiting to turn right into the site driveway.

Comment No. 44-7

6. Queue lanes are insufficient for traffic along Victory Bl. and along Topanga Canyon Bl.: The proposed additional traffic lanes on Victory Blvd. and Topanga Canyon Blvd. are insufficient to handle the queuing of traffic waiting to gain entry into the Village from either route. Because cars entering The Village will have to yield to internal cross traffic by both pedestrians and cars going perpendicular to the main entry and egress points of the development, traffic will be backed up a substantial distance in the newly proposed queue lanes of both Victory and Topanga Canyon. On busy days, queuing traffic has the potential to block Erwin St. as it crosses Topanga Canyon, and Topanga Canyon Bl. as it crosses Victory. This could cause complete gridlock for the West Valley area. If pedestrian and vehicular cross traffic is heavy enough in the Village, it could put people in hazardous situations from impatient drivers trying to access the parking areas.

- How do Westfield and Costco propose to mitigate their cross-traffic [sic] within the Village so that I [sic] does not cause back-up of cars entering any of the Village driveways?

- How can Westfield of the City's DOT guarantee that traffic queues for entering the Village do not gridlock traffic on either Victory or Topanga Canyon Blvd.?
- What "relief" avenues is Westfield proposing along its internal entryways to mitigate any traffic blocks?
- What are the alternative queue areas for cars wishing to gain entry into the Village?
- How can pedestrians crossing the main entry points and drives within the Village plan be protected from traffic going perpendicular to them?

Response to Comment No. 44-7

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding the fuel station's queuing. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project. The proposed mitigations would reduce the impacts at adjacent intersections to less than significant levels.

A dedicated right-turn lane has been proposed to facilitate entry at Westfield Way; minimal queuing on Victory Boulevard is anticipated with entry into the project. The purpose of the additional lane along Topanga Canyon Boulevard is to provide an acceleration/deceleration lane for exiting/entering vehicles; the secondary function is to provide additional queuing space, if necessary, with minimal disruption to the through traffic lanes.

Comment No. 44-8

7. Proposed Entry/Exit for eastern-most Victory opening will cause traffic back ups. [sic]: Designating the eastern-most opening onto the property for both entry any [sic] exit purposes will create traffic flow problems along Victory—especially when large delivery vehicles are factored into the equation.

- What alternate delivery routes has Westfield or Costco proposed to mitigate traffic tie-ups from delivery trucks utilizing the eastern-most driveway on Victory?
- Can driveway be made an "Exit Only" point?

Response to Comment No. 44-8

The easternmost Victory Boulevard driveway has been designed to accommodate right turns in and out only. The primary use of the driveway would be for service vehicles entering the site and for fueling station automobiles exiting the site. If the driveway were made an “exit-only” driveway, the number of truck trips on Owensmouth Avenue would increase.

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station’s queuing and fuel truck deliveries. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project’s measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 44-9

8. Inadequate parking for proposed staffing of both Costco and the Village retail areas.: The plans indicate 1755 parking spaces for Phase I of the Village plan. That figure includes both customer vehicles and employees. The number of Costco employees is estimated at approximately 320 people. The employees of the other retailers can be estimated at approximately 200 people. Figuring that only half of the total number would be present at any one time, that still leaves a total of less than 1,500 spaces available for customers of the entire Village complex. The argument that a large number of those employees would be utilizing mass transit is cannot be proved and is probably fallacious.

- What steps have both Westfield and Costco taken to create a specified employee parking area?
- Where would “employee parking” be located-especially during peak shopping periods?
- What “feeder” transportation is being proposed if Westfield/Costco propose employee parking at a distant location?

Response to Comment No. 44-9

Traffic Study Table 14B (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) details the projected parking demand of each land use that comprises Phase 1 of the project. The peak weekday employee demand (office and retail) is projected at 358 spaces. Compared to the Phase 1 parking supply (1,755 spaces), this would leave approximately 1,397 spaces for weekday customers. The peak weekend employee demand is estimated at 250 spaces and is lower in comparison to the weekday demand. In combination with increased customer demand on the peak month weekend, approximately 46 additional off-site parking spaces would be required during the peak month (December) weekends to satisfy the overall parking

demand. Based on the shared parking analysis summarized in Traffic Study Table 16B (Draft EIR Appendix H-3), there would be adequate parking during all peak parking demand periods upon completion of the project to satisfy both customer and employee demands.

Retail employee parking is typically discouraged/prohibited from the desirable areas of the parking supply and generally encouraged towards the upper levels of the parking structure. If necessary, office employee parking may also be restricted to a specific area. As with the Applicant's other developments during the peak holiday shopping periods, an off-site employee parking program may be implemented. This program typically entails a supply of nearby off-site parking and a shuttle service for the employees.

Comment No. 44-10

9. Location of proposed traffic lights at both Victory and Topanga Canyon entry/exit points are located too close to nearby traffic signals.: Since both Topanga canyon [sic] Bl. and Victory Bl. At both key traffic arteries for the West Valley, placing additional traffic lights at these two locations will severely impede the flow of vehicles and cause serious gridlock conditions—especially for the Victory Bl. Entry [sic] since the proposal is to move it significantly west toward Topanga Canyon Bl.

- How can Westfield or the City's DOT guarantee that the proposed entry/egress points for the Village will not back traffic up sufficiently to impede the Topanga/Victory intersection?
- Can the entry point to the Village be moved eastward on Victory Blvd. to insure that waiting traffic will not impede the Topanga canyon[sic]/Victory intersection?
- Can Village driveways be made Exit only and Entry only in a better attempt to mitigate traffic?
- If the Victory driveways allow for both entry and exit, how can traffic be mitigated so as not to conflict with traffic exiting the Topanga Canyon Mall across the street?
- Can the proposed Traffic signals at the Topanga Canyon entrance be eliminated?
- Can a median be created in Topanga Canyon Blvd. to prevent southbound traffic from having to cross the northbound traffic? A signal at this point with a left turn signal will add significant delays to traffic negotiating the length of Topanga Canyon Blvd. from Mulholland (to the south) and to Sherman Way (to the north).

Response to Comment No. 44-10

The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project. The proposed mitigations would reduce the impacts at adjacent major intersections to less than significant levels. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-7 for a discussing of the queuing analysis of Victory Boulevard.

The signalized driveway on Topanga Canyon Boulevard proposes signalization at an existing site access point. The intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS A upon completion and would be a part of the ATSAC/ATCS system, which coordinates signals to optimize the movement of through traffic. If the driveway were to remain unsignalized, additional congestion could occur due to southbound left-turning vehicles backing up into the through traffic lanes.

Installation of a median along Topanga Canyon Boulevard would negatively impact access to businesses located on the west side of the street.

Comment No. 44-11

10. Significant reflected heat from roof of Costco building and large paved parking area.: The Warner Center area already suffers from an over abundance of concrete and asphalt parking lots reflecting intense head into nearby residential areas. Add to that increased heat, the reflected heat generated by the flat roof of the Costco building and there is no satisfactory mitigation of this problem addressed in the EIR.

- How does Westfield [sic] intend to reduce the heat reflection?
- Can addition trees be mandated for planting throughout the open parking areas in an effort to maximize greenery, oxygen production, CO2 absorption and heat generation?
- Can the roof of the Costco building be fitted with solar panels that would a) absorb solar energy; and b) reduce energy usage by the retailer?

Response to Comment No. 44-11

Refer to Response to Comment No. 19-33 regarding measures proposed to reduce heat effects.

Comment No. 44-12**11. No storage area for hazardous waste from the Costco Tire Center is proposed:**

Costco proposed a major tire and automotive after care center that will dispense both tires and batteries. Neither Costco nor Westfield have supplied plans nor addressed the problems of storage of old, traded-in tires or old car batteries—a serious environmental hazard.

- Where is the proposed old tire and used battery storage area to be located?
- What safety precautions or special storage precautions are being taken to insure [sic] that battery fluids will not contaminate ground water?
- What safety precautions are being taken to insure that old tires awaiting pick-up and disposal will not be allowed to retain any rainwater or water fro [sic] other sources and thereby become a breeding ground for mosquitoes?
- How will old batteries and tires be stored from view of motorists or pedestrians?

Response to Comment No. 44-12

The storage of new and used tire, batteries and related products will comply with all federal, state and local regulations. The storage area for the used and new tires and batteries is within the building confines of the service area and all tires and batteries are kept indoors until they are picked up for disposal. A recycling contractor specializing in disposal of hazardous items would arrive once a day to remove tires, every other day for used batteries. Since the tires and batteries are kept indoors until pick-up and disposal by a specialized recycling contractor, there is no opportunity for exposure to groundwater resources. In addition, there is also no opportunity for tires to be exposed to water or rainwater and therefore to become a breeding area for mosquitoes or other insects.

Comment No. 44-13

Please note that the above issues and questions only are the tip of the iceberg of issues that have not adequately been addressed or answered by the Draft EIR. However, the Planning Department has made the unwise and unfair decision to only allow for 60 days of research into a proposal that entails thousands of pages, millions of figures and zillions of somewhat dubious claims. A proposal of this size should by law require more time for the public analysis and response. To expect the public to catch what the already depleted City Planning Department misses is unfair and bad for the community and the City of LA.

Response to Comment No. 44-13

The Village at Westfield Topanga Draft EIR is comprehensive, consisting of nine volumes, two of which are the main sections of the Draft EIR and the remaining seven volumes of which include appendices. The Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA requirements. Potential impacts are based on the significance thresholds and methodologies set forth within the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. With regard to the Draft EIR public review period, according to the California Code of Regulations, Section 15105(a), “the public review period for a draft EIR shall not be less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. When a draft EIR is submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies, the public review period shall not be less than 45 days, unless a shorter period, not less than 30 days, is approved by the State Clearinghouse.” The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 45

Colleen Marmor
4600 San Feliciano Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 45-1

I have the following comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the above referenced [sic] project.

Woodland Hills is a community that initiates, executes and supports projects and initiatives for the physical, social and cultural improvement of Woodland Hills and Warner Center. This project should be designed and built to environmental standards that will provide for sustainable development and environmental responsibility in energy and water use, air quality, transportation, waste reduction and open space. The project as currently presented falls sort on these concepts. The FEIR should include Alternatives that include true walkability, and discerning design.

Response to Comment No. 45-1

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project includes numerous sustainability features in the areas of energy, water use, air quality, transportation, waste reduction and open space. In addition, the majority of the project would be designed to achieve the standards of the Silver Rating under the US Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design (LEED) green building program, or equivalent green building standards. The anchor retailer building would be designed to achieve the standards of LEED Certified, or an equivalent green building standard, at minimum. The project would also be designed to meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Code. LEED standards would be incorporated through measures that would reduce energy and water usage, and thus reduce associated greenhouse gas emissions. Thus, the project would incorporate an environmentally sustainable design utilizing green building technologies that involve more resource-efficient modes of construction through energy efficiency, water conservation, environmentally preferable building materials, and waste reduction. Please also refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response No. 5 regarding proposed project design features that would enhance walkability within and around the project site.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section § 15126.6, the intent of the Draft EIR alternatives analysis is to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the

proposed project. In accordance with CEQA, a range of reasonable alternatives was considered in the Draft EIR analysis. These alternatives included six alternatives that addressed the feasibility of eliminating or reducing the significant impacts of the project. CEQA does not require that all possible alternatives proposed be analyzed.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 45-2

While the developer has said they are responsive to community feedback, their actions and this DEIR show otherwise. The FEIR should explain just how the downsized plan responds to community feedback and consumer demand. On the contrary, feedback among the neighbors shows that only select individuals within the community were solicited for input.

What is needed is honest community input. Opportunities to accomplish this have not been explored. Instead, courting the Chamber of Business community and other non-residential groups has been the focus.

Response to Comment No. 45-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-2 regarding the opportunities for public input.

Comment No. 45-3

The FEIR should be specific about the 50% open space claim. What % of the 50% is going to be parking lot?

Response to Comment No. 45-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-2 for more information regarding the project's open space areas and consistency with the Specific Plan's open space requirements.

Comment No. 45-4

Business Enterprise Zone perks and discounts

The FEIR should explain in detail, how much tax money and other revenue will be lost and unavailable to the San Fernando Valley when Westfield and their tenants, like Costco,

receive substantial tax breaks now that Warner Center is considered a Business Enterprise Zone? Specifically, the FEIR should explain the following:

- the types and anticipated amounts of tax breaks that will be used
- the estimated value of the 35% reduction on utilities from DWP (discounts) over the next 10 years for both Westfield and Costco
- the \$37,400 tax credit for each employee hired and how it applies to Westfield and Costco
- the tax credits to be used for buying machinery and equipment – does this mean less taxes are paid so less revenue is available for Angelenos?
- How Westfield will make use of the privilege of priority bidding on state contracts, and [sic]
- How much revenue will be saved by the estimated deductions on loan interest
- How much money will be saved by Westfield and their tenants when site plan review fees are waived, and
- With reduced parking space requirements, where will the overflow cars go?

This community cares and will hold the developer responsible for producing a great project.

Response to Comment No. 45-4

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 37-8.

Comment Letter No. 46

Sandra Marsden
Canoga Park, CA
firengrneyes@aol.com

Comment No. 46-1

I am totally against the Costco being built at the Westfield Village at Topanga. DEIR # ENV-2007-3393-EIR, State Clearing House [sic] # 2007101117. This is not what we were promised.

The Public was told a Farmers Market/ The Grove type atmosphere was what was being planed [sic] for that project/area. A Costco was not mentioned nor was it ever presented to the Public until after the project was already in the “works”. [sic] I personally don’t know of any families that like to spend a nice summer evening, or Sunday afternoon strolling threw [sic] a gas station or parking lot.

Response to Comment No. 46-1

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project’s walkability and pedestrian design.

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, in response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, the project was reduced in size by approximately 774,000 square feet. In July 2010, a Notice of Community Workshop was mailed to the public with information about the reduced project, including the anchor retailer, and a public meeting was held to respond to questions about the refined project. The comment period on the Draft EIR was also extended from 45 days to 60 days to allow the public additional time to comment. The public will have continued opportunities to provide input at each of the public hearings that will be held by the City of Los Angeles on the project. Modified site plans proposed by the community were also analyzed as Alternative F - Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR for more information. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 46-2

This proposal as it stands is destructive to the community. Costco on Roscoe Blvd. is set back from the street by over 100 ft. and the parkinglot [sic] works as a buffer, allowing people to walk by or drive in.

Response to Comment No. 46-2

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, the project has been designed to provide a pedestrian-oriented outdoor retail environment that will include improvements to the streetscape. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 46-3

Knowing that no lanes will be added the traffic will only get much [sic] congested than it already is. Have all traffic studies been exhausted??

Response to Comment No. 46-3

A series of mitigation measures have been proposed to address the project's traffic impacts. The mitigation measures include physical street improvements (i.e. roadway widening) as well as TDM-type measures. Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking of the Draft EIR describes the mitigation measures proposed for the project.

Comment No. 46-4

This community has major, valid concerns. Topanga Westfield and Costco have not compromised at all, even after hearing many of the community concerns.

Nothing about the traffic, nothing about the set back, nothing about walking friendly [sic] and bicycle friendly [sic] uses.

Please submit my comments [sic] I do not wish to give my street address. I understand outcome [sic] will not come in email.

Response to Comment No. 46-4

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project's setbacks, walkability, and bicycle friendly amenities. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-2 regarding the opportunities for public input that have been and will continue to be provided regarding the project.

Comment Letter No. 47

Brian McDonald
20627 Tiara St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 47-1

I am contacting you to submit my comments regarding the proposed Westfield Warner Center Project.

First, as a 45 year [sic] resident of Woodland Hills and a stakeholder in the community, I have served on the Woodland Hills Warner Center NC as the Area 1 Residential Representative and as a current Director-at-Large on the Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization, so I know firsthand of the changes that Woodland Hills and Warner Center have seen over the years. As a resident and stakeholder, I support the idea of Costco opening a store in Woodland Hills, however, the proposed location and the plan to sell gasoline on premises will have a negative impact on traffic, noise, blight and the overall quality of life in the Warner Center vicinity.

With that, I would like to submit several comments that I would like to have a response to in the FEIR document.

Response to Comment No. 47-1

This comment providing an overview of the background of the Commentor is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Refer to Sections IV.E, Land Use; IV.F, Noise; IV.H, Traffic, Access and Parking, of the Draft EIR for the analysis of potential urban decay, noise, and traffic impacts, respectively, associated with the project.

Comment No. 47-2**Comment**

With the exception of (1) intersection at Mason and Victory (#47). [sic] **Why are there no traffic studies being performed on any intersection EAST of De-Soto?** [sic] It will not take a rocket scientist to determine that city residents will soon learn that the freeway off ramps westbound at Canoga and Topanga are grid-locked as they are today and drivers will attempt to exit the freeway at Tampa or Winnetka and use surface streets to travel to the proposed project. This point was brought to the attention of Westfield representatives

including John Alderson at several community meetings and he agreed to include traffic studies east of De-Soto. [sic] Why has this been omitted?

Response to Comment No. 47-2

The intersection study area was developed by measuring the potential impact of the project traffic on key intersections. Intersections along Winnetka were reviewed to determine whether there would be enough project traffic added to the intersections along this corridor to create a possible significant impact. If so, the intersections would be added to the study. Because of the directional distribution of project traffic (as developed using the Southern California Association of Governments regional travel demand forecasting model) and the tendency of project traffic to dissipate the farther away one gets from the project site, the intersections along Winnetka or Tampa would not experience enough project traffic to cause a significant impact. Therefore, these intersections were not added as study intersections. The boundaries of the study area were expanded until there were no more significant impacts at the intersections on any of the boundaries of the study area.

Comment No. 47-3

Comment

Neighborhood Intrusion. Starting at Corbin Avenue and heading west, Oxnard Street is a collector road that “feeds” into Warner Center. Cars exiting at Winnetka will use Oxnard Street to travel to Warner Center. **Why are no traffic studies being planned or completed to determine Neighborhood Intrusion for the areas bordered by Winnetka on the East, De-Soto [sic] on the West, Oxnard on the North and Ventura Blvd on the South?**

Response to Comment No. 47-3

Figure 58 of the Traffic Study (page 400) shows the corridors where the project would add a total of 1,600 vehicles per day. If the project adds less than this amount of daily traffic (1,600 vehicles), it is very unlikely that it would result in enough diverted traffic to residential streets to cause a local street significant impact during the peak hour (see page 392 of the Traffic Study for a discussion of the LADOT neighborhood impact criteria). None of the streets in the area referenced in the comment meet the criteria for neighborhood impacts because the project does not add 1,600 daily trips to any street within the boundaries cited. Therefore, the cited area is not likely to experience a local street significant impact as a result of the project.

Comment No. 47-4

Comment

How will Costco handle RV's [sic] and large vehicles at the station?

Response to Comment No. 47-4

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 35-10.

Comment No. 47-5

Comment

The DIER and current plans do not appear to have adequate storage areas for trash, pallets, and waste. Where will Costco store these items?

Response to Comment No. 47-5

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 44-3 for a discussion of the storage area for the anchor retailer.

Comment No. 47-6

Comment

Why are the minimum setbacks as specified in the current Warner Center Specific not being adhered to?

Response to Comment No. 47-6

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 47-7

I look forward to responses to my comments in the FEIR. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Response to Comment No. 47-7

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 48

Denise A. Richardson
9162 Sophia Ave.
North Hills, CA 91343

Comment No. 48-1

After reviewing the proposals of the Draft EIR for The Village at Westfield Topanga project, I have strong concerns that relevant facts have been overlooked or omitted, the accuracy of analysis is questionable and there are major problems inherent in the DEIR findings that have not been sufficiently addressed which will impact the quality of life in the West San Fernando Valley.

It is my belief that Westfield's proposals leave many key questions unanswered, and that a revised EIR is necessary that completely addresses these important potential problems. I believe the current EIR is deficient in fully addressing or analyzing the following:

Response to Comment No. 48-1

The Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA requirements. Potential impacts have been fully disclosed and are based on the significance thresholds and methodologies set forth within the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, where feasible, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the environmental impacts of the proposed project. As demonstrated by the response to comments in this Final EIR, there are no new significant impacts associated with the project that have not already been identified as part of the Draft EIR. Thus, recirculation of a revised EIR is not required. The specific comments made by the Commentor are individually responded to below. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 48-2

(LIST ONE OR MORE KEY CONSIDERATIONS/PROBLEMS)

It is also my concern that neither Westfield, Costco nor the City of Los Angeles has sufficiently mitigated key problems in the areas of traffic, safety and environmental impact on the area. A revised EIR should be initiated that fully mitigates the impact of this development on the residents, merchants and resources of this area.

Response to Comment No. 48-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a detailed discussion of the project's traffic impact analysis.

Comment Letter No. 49

Henry Rice
ricehj@pacbell.net

Comment No. 49-1

I am a long time resident of Woodland Hills and am very interested in the project at Warner Center. Below are my comments on the DEIR. I request that they be seriously considered before final approval of the project.

Response to Comment No. 49-1

This comment introduces the comments to the Draft EIR for the project. All comments on the Draft EIR have been responded to as part of this Final EIR and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 49-2

1. There is no mention or analysis of the impact of electricity use by the project. While LEEDS design compliance will help to mitigate the impact, analysis of the consumption in conjunction with the DWP is needed. With threatened rolling brown outs during the hottest summer periods analysis of the impact on the grid capacity is essential.

Response to Comment No. 49-2

As discussed in the Initial Study and in Section VI, Other Environmental Considerations, of the Draft EIR the project would not result in impacts associated with electricity use. In addition, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power will be involved in the design and development process of the project. Also, see Response to Comment No. 18-48 regarding the sustainability features that will be included as part of the project.

Comment No. 49-3

2. If a fueling station is to be included in the project, the economic impact on local gas stations and traffic should be included. There may not be a need for another fueling station in the area. One station owner has already expressed concern about the impact on his business.

Response to Comment No. 49-3

The traffic impacts of all project land uses, including the fueling station, are addressed in the Draft EIR (see pages 710–823 of Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking), and Appendix H, Traffic Study. The potential for the fueling station to cause urban decay impacts as a result of business competition is addressed in Topical Response No. 6. That Topical Response concludes that the fueling station will not result in urban decay.

Comment No. 49-4

Additionally placing a large station in one location intensifies the already traffic congestion situation. Smaller stations distributed in the surrounding community is a better solution [sic]

Response to Comment No. 49-4

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods after project mitigation. This is one full level better than the minimum acceptable Level of Service D.

Comment No. 49-5

3. Volume II, Page 914 – Alternatives Considered and Rejected – Modified Site Plan with Fueling Station Internal to the Site.

Statement is made that “However, as 40 percent pass-by users would utilize the fueling station, -----.” This would indicate that 40% of those passing by are Costco members to be able to use the facility. Without any back up [sic] data the statement is questionable. Furthermore Costco officials have stated it is not their plan to post gas prices and attempt to attract passing motorists.

Response to Comment No. 49-5

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-8 regarding the pass-by traffic expected to utilize the member-only fueling station. The anchor retailer does not propose to post gasoline price signage along the bounding streets.

Comment No. 49-6

Also an argument is put forth that internal location of the fueling station would increase the opportunities for vehicular and pedestrian conflicts.

Further review of the traffic flow alternatives should be done. Placement of the fueling station adjacent to the parking lot should be evaluated. Without further evaluation both arguments are not sufficient to reject the alternative of an internally located fueling station.

Response to Comment No. 49-6

Relocation of the fueling station adjacent to the parking lot results in an internalized fueling station. Relocating the fueling station to a spot adjacent to the parking lot would result in more traffic travelling through the parking areas and along the internal roadways of the site. This would increase the number of pedestrian/vehicular conflicts.

Comment No. 49-7

4. Executive Summary – Pages 10, 11. 4. Overview of Proposed Project – B. Parking and Site Access

“Specifically, parking for the new anchor retailer constructed as part of Phase 1 would be provided in a grade plus one level parking facility within the central portion of the project as well as within a surface parking area to the south of the anchor retailer building.”

This statement gives priority to the parking structure with no provision for shopping carts. Shopping carts should be banned from the structure, or a storage location should be provided on the grade level of the structure.

Response to Comment No. 49-7

Storage for shopping carts associated with the anchor retailer will be provided within the grade level and first level of the parking structure, in a designated location designed for minimal interference with parked cars.

Comment No. 49-8

5. Executive Summary –Page 26 Alternative E: Reduced Project – Buildout of Phase 1 Alternative

This alternative should be seriously considered to help mitigate traffic congestion. The addition of the hotel and office building brings many more people to the area with resulting traffic congestion. Phase 2 could possibly be reevaluated after all traffic mitigating improvements have been implemented.

Response to Comment No. 49-8

Alternative E, Reduced Project – Buildout of Phase 1, is included in the Draft EIR for consideration by the decision maker. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 49-9

6. Executive Summary Page 31 #7, Page 70, and Page 155, Figure H-7 (Ariel [sic] Conceptual Rendering)

On page 70 it is stated “Much of the supplied parking for the project would be centrally located within the City block that includes the project site and integrated with the new uses, and thus would not be highly visible from the major thoroughfares of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Victory Boulevards.”

The rendering on page 155 shows significant visibility from both boulevards, and the fact that only 2 story buildings separate the parking structure from the boulevards indicates that the statement is incorrect. If phase 1 only buildout is selected, then the grade plus 1 level would eliminate this visual concern. If phase 2 becomes part of the project, then distributing the parking to other structures as well should be considered to keep the height down.

Response to Comment No. 49-9

Figure II-7, page 155, of the Draft EIR, provides a conceptual rendering as seen from the air, and thus provides views that are not otherwise available to the general public. Conversely, Figure II-12, page 160, of the Draft EIR, shows a conceptual rendering of the project along Topanga Canyon Boulevard which is most indicative of the views to be provided to the public. As shown therein, the parking structure would not be highly visible from Topanga Canyon Boulevard. Also refer to Figures IV.A-12 and IV.A-13 in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR as well as the elevations of the parking structure provided in Topical Response No. 5.

Comment Letter No. 50

Stephen Santen
5801 Fairhaven Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 50-1

I am a long-time resident of our city, and I am writing to express my concerns, comments and questions regarding “The Village at Westfield Topanga, Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)”. [sic]

I support the effort to bring a project of this scale to our community. In these trying times I welcome the investment into our community. I hope that my input will be well received and used as an encouragement to make the project better.

Response to Comment No. 50-1

This comment introducing the comments regarding the Draft EIR made by the Commentor is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 50-2

Layout

I understand that some in our community have voiced concern over the footprint and layout of the large rectangular building with a 400+ft wall facing the main thoroughfare. The attempts to disguise the wall are commendable but without anything to draw the pedestrians, the sidewalk is not activated, inviting nor walkable [sic].

I would like to see a smaller footprint and the block sizes reduced to provide smaller walkable blocks. I feel the building at a minimum could be pushed back away from the street with sidewalk access to retail shops. The massive parking structure should be broken up into smaller pieces that support each area of commerce.

Response to Comment No. 50-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building’s Victory Boulevard design and the façade of the parking structure. Please

refer to Alternative F, Modified Site Plans, in Section V, Alternatives of the Draft EIR, for the Draft EIR's analysis of alternative site plans.

Comment No. 50-3

Traffic

The number one issue with the traffic studies is that they are not based in fact but rather in extrapolations and simulations.

"Trip generation studies" is not the same as actual customer data at the specific Canoga and Westlake Village locations.

Costco is a membership only store and every transaction is recorded for studies in demographic shopping patterns. This is just good business. I appreciate all of the efforts to analyze the intersections, however...

The traffic study omits the existing customer traffic at the Canoga Park Costco location.

The traffic study omits the existing customer traffic at the Westlake Village Costco location.

The baseline traffic estimates should include 100% of the actual customer traffic who currently go to the Canoga Park Costco location, "Plus" the number of customers who currently use the Agoura Store and live/work in the surrounding area of the new store location.

Traffic formulas and empirical data, are based on limited observations, and should only be used for the portion where historical/actual data does not exist.

This data does exist. Why was it ignored?

The assumptions should be:

1. The Canoga Park Costco location will be closing and all of their customers will transition to the new location.
2. The customers traveling out of the area to shop at the Westlake Village Costco location will transition to the new Topanga store.

3. Additional customers will be added who were unwilling to travel to either of the current locations.

(All of these assumptions are based on statements by Costco Executive Jackie Frank in public meetings) Costco tracks their “Member” trips etc [sic] so this should be an easy thing for them to contribute to the study.

Response to Comment No. 50-3

Trip generation data was provided by Costco based on actual experience at existing stores. The Traffic Study Addendum (Draft EIR Appendix H-5), Attachment 1 details the development of the empirical data. Distribution of the project trips was based on use of the SCAG regional model and compared against the experience at the existing Westfield Topanga.

Comment No. 50-4

Victory street widening will not be enough to accommodate increasingly heavier traffic, especially how that traffic flows in conjunction with the exits from the Gas station.

Response to Comment No. 50-4

The Victory Boulevard widening along the project frontage will provide an additional lane of through traffic capacity in the eastbound direction. The intersections along the project frontage on Victory Boulevard are anticipated to be mitigated to levels below significance upon completion of the project.

Comment No. 50-5

I was told I would be shown the modeling of the gas station queuing. I have serious concerns that this could be a traffic jam that is not thoroughly planned out.

Response to Comment No. 50-5

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for exhibits showing fuel station queuing, and information regarding the fuel station’s queuing.

Comment No. 50-6

The report calls for a “Neighborhood Traffic Management Program sponsored by the project applicant.” How does this actually fix the problem?

Response to Comment No. 50-6

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a detailed discussion of the project's potential neighborhood impacts and neighborhood protection program.

Comment No. 50-7**Security Programs and Equipment**

Historically the inside of the malls have been covered adequately with security and cameras. The parking lot and parking structure areas have proven in recent history to be vulnerable to vehicle and vehicle equipment thieves. Vandals have been so bold as to vandalize Police Patrol and unmarked detective cars at a recent Maggiano's event while the cars were parked in the Westfield Promenade lot. I am concerned that the proposed "enhanced security program" may not be robust enough to adequately deter this activity. This size of project will require additional manpower from the LAPD if the security is not robust enough.

Response to Comment No. 50-7

As described in Section IV.G.2, Public Services – Police Protection, of the Draft EIR, the project would incorporate several project design features and would implement mitigation measures to ensure on-site security and a crime prevention design in order to maintain high levels of safety for employees, patrons, and visitors. In coordination with LAPD, these security features would include on-site security to patrol the perimeter of the property, control and monitor activities in parking facilities and public spaces, and assist with patron access and monitor entrances and exits; an enhanced security program consisting of industry standard security lighting, closed-circuit television (CCTV) monitoring, and license plate recognition (LPR); a crime prevention design to ensure landscaping to be planted does not provide obvious cover for persons tampering with doors or windows or for persons lying in wait, lighting to reduce areas of concealment and provide pedestrian orientation and to clearly identify a secure route, and design of public spaces and parking facilities to be easily patrolled and accessed by safety personnel; and a security program regarding the anchor retailer member-only auto sales that would provide after hours security, in addition to project security during regular business hours, of the anchor retailer and outdoor vehicles. Please refer to Section IV.G.2, Public Services – Police Protection of the Draft EIR for additional information regarding the safety and security project design features to be implemented by the project.

Comment No. 50-8**Environmental**

The Santa Susanna Field Lab, SSFL investigation and cleanup activities at the SSFL include soils investigations and cleanup, groundwater cleanup and monitoring, hazardous materials and waste handling, air quality testing and radiation cleanup program. Three California state agencies and three federal agencies have been overseeing a detailed investigation of environmental impacts from historical site operations since at least 1990. The CA-DTSC: SSFL Project, [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Santa Susana Field Lab/](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/SantaSusanaFieldLab/) is the lead regulatory agency for the site cleanup.

Fuel Tanks

I am confident that a qualified engineer can plan the installation of the fuel tanks. The water table data is not current and depicts a low water, drought year. What concerns me is that during tank installations, the dewatering of the pits will draw the groundwater more rapidly and possibly draw the contamination plume with it. The DEIR makes no reference to the SSFL or the effect the project will have as it relates to that clean-up and monitoring effort. Even with the mitigation measures, potential impacts associated with geology and soils would **Not** be reduced to less than significant levels because it has not been considered.

Response to Comment No. 50-8

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding groundwater, geology, and the safety measures to be implemented as part of the fueling station.

Based on information available online at the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), there do not appear to be any toxic plumes adjacent to the site. Further, the minimal amount of dewatering that may be needed at the fuel station would not pull ground water from adjacent areas to the site¹³.

As discussed in greater detail in Response to Comment No. 19-20, based on their distances from the project site, the areas in the project vicinity with potential groundwater contamination would not be affected by any potential dewatering at the fuel station. The

¹³ Based on analysis conducted by Kleinfelder West, Inc., May 2011.

Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) is roughly five miles away from the proposed site and it is extremely unlikely that the minimal amount of dewatering efforts that may happen at the project's fueling station would draw any of the solvent or other pollution that affects that area. Based on information available online, both the Pratt & Whitney Canoga Avenue facility at 21600 Vanowen Street and the Rockwell International Corporation-Boeing facility at 6633 Canoga Avenue appear to have open environmental cases. However, these facilities are down gradient from the project site, as compared to the northeasterly direction of groundwater flow in the area of the site. Therefore, given that the groundwater would need to be pulled "up hill" to the project site, it is extremely unlikely that the minimal amount of dewatering efforts that may happen at the fueling station would draw pollution affecting these areas (if any) to the project site.¹⁴

Comment No. 50-9

Liquefaction

The DEIR acknowledges "liquefaction poses a potentially significant risk to the project" the sandy nature of the soils but does not address the issue of a high water table and soil liquefaction effects on large structures like those proposed. The report states "potential for liquefaction is low based on the soil type, depth to groundwater..." this [sic] is based on outdated water table data as mentioned before. The water table is at times zero and water freely flows on the surface after a heavy rain and the percolation is fully underway. Therefore the risks would not be reduced to less than significant levels.

Response to Comment No. 50-9

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a discussion of the groundwater levels at the location of the fueling station, the potential for liquefaction at the location of the fueling station, and the seismic standards that would be implemented for the fueling station and underground storage tanks. Free-flowing water on the surface after a heavy rain is not necessarily indicative that the water table level is zero and at the surface. Anytime the rate of precipitation exceeds the rate of infiltration, water will flow freely at the surface. This is the case at the project site, given that the percolation rate for this type of soil is less than 0.5 inch per hour.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

Comment No. 50-10

Heat Island

The current layout will contribute to excessive heat amplified by the large parking structure and on grade parking.

Response to Comment No. 50-10

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-33 for a discussion of potential heat effects of the project.

Comment No. 50-11

Thank you for your attention in this matter, I am looking forward to your response.

Response to Comment No. 50-11

All comments on the Draft EIR that have been submitted to the City of Los Angeles have been addressed in this Final EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 51

Albert J. Saur
5416 Manton Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 51-1

This letter presents my personal comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on proposed construction and modification of buildings and other proposed changes in the area just south of Victory Boulevard and between Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue in Woodland Hills. The DEIR was prepared for a proposed location of a CostCo [sic] store and associated gasoline filling station at the site.

I have studied the DEIR as part of my duties as an Alternate Member of the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council. That body has submitted comments about the DEIR in the form of committee reports. I have contributed comments for those reports and I agree completely with their recommendations. I would like to call your attention to a few specific features of the proposed location of CostCo [sic] that are particularly troubling to me.

Response to Comment No. 51-1

This comment provides an introduction of the Commentor as an Alternate Member of the Woodland Hills Warner Center Neighborhood Council and introduces comments and questions regarding the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 51-2

My first objection to the plan is that the area allotted to CostCo [sic] is too small. The nature of CostCo [sic]'s business requires a large parking lot area. CostCo [sic] shoppers generally buy a large volume of merchandise and take it to their cars in grocery carts and wagons. The cars should be parked at the same level as the entrance and exit of the store. In the area proposed for CostCo [sic] there would be some ground level parking and some several level parking structures. Customers of CostCo [sic] would compete with customers of other stores and shops in the area for parking space. CostCo [sic] customers would not like to haul their purchases up stairways, ramps, or elevators to their cars if they were parked on an elevated floor of a parking structure. Either the CostCo [sic] customers would decide to shop at other CostCo [sic] stores or the customers of other shops in the area, such as the Crate and Barrel store already in place, would decide to shop elsewhere.

Trying to squeeze a Costco [sic] store into a limited space along with other stores and shops just isn't going to work. I predict that Costco [sic] Management would decide, after a year or so, to abandon the site and move to a better location.

Response to Comment No. 51-2

The project has been designed to provide an efficient use of land on the project site. The combination of surface parking and structured parking allows for ease of pedestrian movement between land uses without requiring patrons to move their cars. Additionally, the consolidation of the anchor on the northeast corner of the site allows for more open space, meandering sidewalks, trails and common area along the perimeter and interior of the project.

Most urban retail and mixed-use developments include a combination of surface and structured parking and the proposed project is no exception. It is anticipated that the shoppers at the anchor retailer will generally utilize shopping carts for their purchases and therefore the surface parking has been located outside the proposed anchor retail store. Shoppers at the anchor retailer may also use the lower level of the parking structure, although to a lesser extent than the surface parking area. The remainder of the shops, restaurants, office and hotel would generally be served by structured parking, which would be located closer and thus more conveniently to these uses.

Comment No. 51-3

My second objection is that the proposed Costco [sic] building would be an eyesore. Costco [sic] stores do not have display windows for objects on sale. They are not like Sears, Nordstrom, Macy's, or Neiman-Marcus, all of whom present attractive display windows for the public. If the building for Costco [sic] is located right at Victory Boulevard the public will see a long blank wall. That's bad enough. Such a large blank public space would be irresistibly tempting to taggers.

I strongly urge that the City Planning Department should reject the plan to locate or relocate a Costco [sic] store in the proposed location.

Response to Comment No. 51-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5. In addition, in order to address the potential for graffiti on any of the project buildings, Mitigation Measures A-6 and A-7 will be implemented to ensure that buildings remain graffiti-free. The Commentor is correct that the anchor retailer would not have display windows for objects on sale. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 52

C. Lisa Schafer
4249 Alhama Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91363

Comment No. 52-1

This has been sent in order to provide my personal comments with regard to the above-indicated project. I have been a resident of Woodland Hills for approximately thirty (30) years. I also spent my childhood here. I am, thus, familiar with and concerned about this community.

I will begin by stating that it is virtually impossible to acquaint oneself with and, therefore, respond to the Draft Environmental Report due to its voluminous nature. The community simply has not had an adequate opportunity to address the enormity of the concerns and changes that have been made to the original plans that were presented to us several years ago for "The Village at Westfield". [sic] At that time we had a completely different understanding about what was to go forward at this location. When a consensus and agreement was reached between local residents, businesses, concerned citizens and Westfield as to what this project would entail, there was nothing in mind that would allow for a "Big Box Retailer", [sic] such as Costco, to be a major component of it.

Response to Comment No. 52-1

The Village at Westfield Topanga Draft EIR consists of nine volumes, two of which are the Draft EIR and the remaining seven volumes of which include appendices. In addition, the Draft EIR also includes a Summary section that summarizes the impacts of the project by environmental topic and includes mitigation measures proposed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document.

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, in response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, the project was reduced in size by approximately 774,000 square feet. In July 2010, a Notice of Community Workshop was mailed to the public with information about the reduced project, including the anchor retailer.

Comment No. 52-2

In any event, in a brief review of the Report, one is actually informed that during the “Initial Study” it was determined that this project did not have the potential to cause a significant impact to the environment or any local resources. I fail to see how that is possible, when there is going to be a “significant and unavoidable” impact from traffic alone, per the Report. An increase in the volume of vehicles that would be coming into Woodland Hills for a “Big-Box Retailer”, [sic] such as Costco, not only from customers and employees, but also from the number of delivery and fuel trucks that will be driving upon the local and neighborhood streets to transport items and service this retailer, is not something that takes place in a vacuum. It spills over and interacts with health issues, aesthetic issues, environmental issues and pollution issues, including noise, air-quality, emissions from these vehicles and so forth. Hence, the reason for my concerns about the accuracy of this statement alone.

Response to Comment No. 52-2

As indicated in Section I, Executive Summary, pages 2-3, of the Draft EIR, the City of Los Angeles determined through the Initial Study, that the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Wastewater. All other environmental resources were analyzed in the Draft EIR, including air quality, traffic, and noise. In addition, potential hazards impacts associated with the fueling station were addressed in Section IV.G.1, Fire Protection, of the Draft EIR. Also refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding the fueling station and to Topical Response No. 1 regarding the potential traffic impacts associated with the project.

Comment No. 52-3

It is further stated that in order to comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan, this Project would need to “compliment existing retailers” in Warner Center. It is then stated that this Project had been designed with this in mind and to “revitalize” the actual project site and “unify the existing shopping centers”. [sic] Again, I fail to see how a “Big-Box Retailer” would “revitalize” or [sic] have any positive impact on some of the local, smaller retailers in the area or how it would benefit the local restaurants or even be patronized by guests at the local, existing hotels, or at the hotel that Westfield claims will be built as part of Phase 2 of this Project. I submit it will have the exact opposite affect [sic]. As a result of this there is actually a very good possibility that Woodland Hills, and specifically the Warner Center area would suffer from “urban decay” because of this. Again, this is something we are told in the Report would not happen, but that it had been considered. Yet common sense would seem to dictate otherwise.

Response to Comment No. 52-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 regarding the attraction to the project area that the retail anchor would provide. A detailed analysis of potential impacts associated with urban decay is provided in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. As indicated therein, the project would not result in significant impacts associated with urban decay.

Comment No. 52-4

To elaborate further on this aspect of the Project, the Promenade, which is basically at the southern end of the Project, already has numerous vacancies from retailers and from restaurants that left when the Topanga Mall was enlarged and remodeled. There is also an increase in the vacancies even at Topanga Mall in recent months because of the downturn in the economy. The addition of a “Big-Box Retailer” cannot possibly bring any benefit to the small businesses that are currently struggling in these malls. They cannot compete with a Costco. Hence, we are going to see multiple vacancies, the failure of small businesses, a decrease in the retail choices that are presently quite accessible to residents of Woodland Hills and we are clearly going to experience “urban decay”, [sic] a term defined and set-out [sic] in the Report.

Response to Comment No. 52-4

The potential for the project to cause economic competition with existing retailers, such that it might have adverse impacts on the physical environment, is addressed in the urban decay analysis in the Draft EIR. It concludes that no such adverse impacts would occur. See pp. 556–563 of Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, and Technical Appendix K, Urban Decay Report.

Comment No. 52-5

Let me also refer to some of the ways this Project is supposedly in compliance with the Warner Center Specific Plan. It claims that it is a “pedestrian-oriented development” and that because the location is “close to a major transportation hub” it would actually reduce vehicle trips and “promote alternative modes of transportation”. [sic] This cannot be a true or accurate statement. Is someone taking public transportation or riding their bicycle actually going to be able to buy anything from Costco and then bring it back to their homes or apartments? I truly doubt this. Whereas with smaller retailers, people who utilize public transportation or use bicycles, would be able to make their purchases and bring those purchases back home. A Costco is not designed for people who use public transportation or bicycle [sic]. Hence, this claimed compliance is a sham.

Response to Comment No. 52-5

The project is proposed to include a number of small retailers, in addition to the anchor retailer, which may or may not be a Costco. The anchor retailer will be approximately 165,759 square feet, whereas the rest of the retail proposed by the project will total 278,985 square feet. The project proposes a number of walkability enhancements to promote the pedestrian-oriented nature of the development. The project's streetscapes would include new meandering sidewalks, multi-use trails, and landscaping, as well as pedestrian lighting and trash receptacles, to create a walkable and pedestrian-oriented environment. The street front corners of the project site (e.g., Owensmouth Avenue at Victory Boulevard, Victory Boulevard at Topanga Canyon Boulevard, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard at Erwin Street) would be further accented with groups of trees, feature elements, and/or pedestrian amenities, such as seating, that would serve as gateway elements into Warner Center. The existing bus stops adjacent to the project site (particularly on Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard) would be physically improved with street furniture and amenities, such as new benches or shelters.

Comment No. 52-6

There is further a statement that this Project was designed with "elements to enhance the surrounding city scape [sic], with multi-use trials, meandering sidewalks, and with publicly accessible landscaped areas". Again, when one looks at what will be put at this location in the foreseeable future, it is simply Phase [sic], a Costco, a "Big-Box Store" with little more than a large cube of a building; a parking lot, a wall up against the street with a "vine" that will be planted to cover it and assorted trees, which initially need only have a "two-inch" diameter. So, I do not see how this is in compliance with the claims made in the Report and the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 52-6

Refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the design of the project including the design of the streetscape along Victory Boulevard. As discussed in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project conforms to the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 52-7

Indeed, the ultimate assertion in what this Project is now claimed to entail, is a Phase 1 and a Phase 2. The Phase 2 portion of this Project appears to be more consistent with what the community understood would be built at the Village at Westfield. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that Phase 2 will likely be abandoned and that what we will have in our community is a "Big-Box Retail" store with a huge gas station that does not

resemble any of the ideas or vision that had been expressed in the Warner Center Specific Plan or in the original Project that had been presented to our community by Westfield.

Response to Comment No. 52-7

The environmental impacts of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been analyzed in the project's EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 52-8

Accordingly, I respectfully present my opposition to this Project and I thank you for your consideration to some of these issues.

Response to Comment No. 52-8

This comment expressing opposition for the project is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 53

Lynn Segal
5044 Campo Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
lynn.segal@sbcglobal.net

Comment No. 53-1

I have reviewed the Draft EIR (ENV-2007-3393-EIR) for The Village at Westfield Topanga. As a resident and business person in Woodland Hills for over 30 years, I have serious reservations concerning the impact to the community based upon information stated in the Draft EIR. While I generally support the development of the property, the EIR highlights two major areas that concern me:

Response to Comment No. 53-1

This comment introducing the comments regarding the Draft EIR made by the Commentor is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. The specific comments made by the Commentor are individually responded to below.

Comment No. 53-2

1 – Traffic: The EIR validates increased traffic, not only within the arbitrarily described borders of Vanowen, Oxnard, Owensmouth, and Topanga, but also extending to Ventura Blvd and the respective 101 freeway ramps at Topanga and Canoga. These two major points of entry to the project will exacerbate their respective neighborhoods which are already experiencing gridlock conditions. I believe an expanded, detailed, and workable remediation effort must be developed and included in the first phase of the plan.

Response to Comment No. 53-2

Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR describes the mitigation measures proposed for both phases of the project.

Comment No. 53-3

2 – Pedestrian Advocacy: The EIR seems to reference the pedestrian friendly [sic] nature within the project perimeter. Emphasis is on the internal areas. The EIR references a 600 foot [sic] wall facing Victory Blvd and extends south on Topanga. The pedestrian friendly [sic] nature does not appear to apply to these areas. Pedestrians are certain to

avoid such walkways that only promise them dust and noise from the traffic on Victory and Topanga. Additionally, the wall appears to be an attractive canvass for graffiti artists.

Response to Comment No. 53-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5.

Comment No. 53-4

Additionally, the wall appears to be an attractive canvass for graffiti artists.

Response to Comment No. 53-4

In order to address the potential for graffiti on any of the project buildings, Mitigation Measures A-6 and A-7 will be implemented to ensure that buildings remain graffiti-free.

Comment No. 53-5

I am not alone with these concerns. How can we make certain that these are addressed prior to approval of the project?

Response to Comment No. 53-5

In accordance with CEQA, all comments on the Draft EIR that have been submitted to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department have been addressed in this Final EIR. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 46-1 for additional information regarding the public's opportunities to provide input on the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 54

Bruce T. Smyth
22601 Oxnard St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
bjcesmyth@sbcglobal.net

Comment No. 54-1

I write to express a number of concerns about the environmental impact analysis in the above-referenced matter, in particular the portion concerning Traffic, Access, and Parking. My family and I live on Oxnard Street between Shoup and Fallbrook and my home is impacted by both the volume and speed [sic] traffic through Oxnard Street which, at the location of my home, is a two-lane street without sidewalks.

The draft environmental impact report for the closest intersection, that at Oxnard and Shoup, intersection number 49 at page 731 of the report, describes the existing base year level of service in the morning as F and in the afternoon as E. Because the portion of the street between Shoup and Fallbrook is a residential neighborhood of single family homes, we are impacted by both the large volume of traffic passing to and from Warner Center often at high speeds. Even after the Westfield mitigation program, the level of service in 2016 at that intersection or projected to remain as F in the morning and E in the evening.

Response to Comment No. 54-1

Mitigation Measure H-32 is able to reduce the project's impact to less than significant levels at the intersection of Shoup Avenue and Oxnard Street. The intersection is projected to operate at the same level of service before and after the project. Oxnard Street, west of Topanga Canyon Boulevard is classified as a "Secondary Highway" in the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Circulation Element (Adopted September 1999). The level of traffic on Oxnard Street is consistent with that classification.

Comment No. 54-2

Even the analysis of project consistency with the applicable transportation policies of the community plan notes that project is not consistent with the applicable policy, at page 809. The applicable policy, 13-1.1, maintaining a satisfactory level of service and no increase in the density or intensity until it is determined that the transportation system can accommodate increased traffic generated by the project, concedes that the project is not consistent as to the intersections that will remain at level of service E or level of service F.

It states that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on up to eight intersections, including the one at Oxnard and Shoup.

Response to Comment No. 54-2

Consistent with this comment, the Draft EIR states that the project is partially consistent with Community Plan Policy 13-1.1. Projects are considered consistent with a land use plan if they are compatible with the general intent of the plans and would not preclude the attainment of their primary goals. As described in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, and Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the project would support the primary goals of the Community Plan. As discussed in Section IV.E, Land Use of the Draft EIR, the project would be consistent with the general intent of the Community Plan and would not preclude attainment of its primary goals. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 54-3

The project as presently proposed increases traffic beyond which the transportation system can accommodate, increases the volume and speeds of traffic on Oxnard Street and results in even greater intrusion into our neighborhood. It should not be permitted to go forward until these deficiencies are remedied.

Thank you for your attention.

Response to Comment No. 54-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 54-1.

Comment Letter No. 55

August Steurer
Co-Chair, Planning, Land Use & Mobility Committee and
Alternate Area 6 Community-Based Organization Representative
Woodland Hills-Warner Center Neighborhood Council
Member, Warner Center Specific Plan Citizen Advisory Committee
1122 Sixth St., #208
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Comment No. 55-1

I have attached my xx-page [sic] comment on the above reference Draft Environmental Impact Report. These comments are my own and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the Woodland Hills-Warner Center Neighborhood Council.

My interest in this project is strong as I have worked in Woodland Hills for 20 years and lived on Alhama Drive for 14 years. Seven years ago, when the community was upset about the perceived rampant development in the community, I became interested in better planning for Woodland Hills and Warner Center.

Because of that interest, I have been Chair or Co-Chair on the PLUM committee for 7 years and dealt with many planning issues and read many books on urban design and listened to hundreds of hours of podcasts regarding Transportation and Urban Design issues.

For the last five years or so, I have also beeb [sic] on the Executive Steering Committee of PlanCheck NC, the organization establish as part of the pilot project between the Planning Department and Neighborhood Councils created by Gail Goldberg.

One of the first things I did as Chair of PLUM was to get the Neighborhood Council to request a restudy of the Warner Center Specific Plan from Councilman Zine and interim control ordinance on residential construction. Consequently, I have been a member of the Warner Center Specific Plan Citizen Advisory Committee from its initiation.

As a very active member, participating in almost all of the sub-committees, I am more aware than the average citizen of the planning challenges facing Warner Center. I was very involved in organizing the Neighborhood Council's assistance to the Planning Department in the Community Forums and Workshops on the Community Vision for Warner Center. The Village at Westfield Topanga project will have a significant influence on the future development of Warner Center.

With respect to the project at hand, as Co-Chair of the Planning, Land Use & Mobility Committee (PLUM) I have been present at many public meetings since 2007 regarding this project which included presentations and discussions with John Alderson of Westfield LLC and a few with Jackie Frank of Costco.

Early on we spent many hours covering the issues of the original proposal in 2007 and Mr. Alderson was made aware of the communities concerns regarding the development of the project. After the project came out of hiatus, Mr. Alderson contacted us and we began discussions anew. Again, through many more discussions the PLUM committee continued to communicate its concerns regarding the project until we reached an impasse.

This is all mentioned just to indicate that I am extremely familiar with the project and the issues of Warner Center and that I ask you to give serious consideration to the personal comments I have made because there are countless hours of thought and study behind them.

Response to Comment No. 55-1

This comment providing an overview of the background of the project and a description of the Commentor's involvement in the project is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-2

I. Executive Summary Comments

4. Overview of Proposed Project

Page 6, Par. 1 *“Westfield LLC (the Applicant) has designed the project to provide for an anchor retailer integrated with smaller lifestyle retailers, a hotel, and other mixed uses which would complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center. Consistent with it’s [sic] established business formula, the Applicant has recognized that anchor retailers are a key component in the successful operation and economic sustainability of its existing adjacent properties and other locations in Warner Center.”*

Plus [sic]

A. Project Characteristics

Page 6, Par. 3 *“The proposed improvements are intended to revitalize the project site, unify the shopping center uses in the surrounding project area, and enhance the Warner Center area. The proposed uses would be consistent with the Regional Shopping Center Designation and would include two primary anchors, the anchor retailer within the northern portion of the site and the hotel within the southern portion of the site.*

Comment: The Applicant controls existing retail anchors on nearby properties for purposes of drawing shoppers to the area. When mentioning “unify the shopping center,” the Applicant must be referring to unifying the applicants [sic] properties as a whole and not Warner Center, which is intended to be more than a shopping center. There is no critical need for an anchor retailer. The Warner Center Plan does not require the anchors in a Regional Shopping Center to be retailers. The hotel and the high-rise office building are of a size to constitute anchors. The Specific Plan does not require that there be one Regional Shopping Center or that they be where the Applicant has properties. It seems that the primary need for this project to be classified a Regional Shopping Center is to qualify for encroachment of surface parking into the 25’ setback requirements within the plan by virtue of fitting the definition of Regional Shopping Center in the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-2

An anchor retailer is a critical component of all of the Applicant’s developments and is a traditional part of most shopping centers. Anchor retail stores, which can be department stores or a major retail chain, are used to provide the primary draw for people to visit a shopping center. People have the opportunity to combine this visit with visiting other smaller retail shops, dining at adjacent restaurants, or watching a movie. The project Applicant designed the project to provide for an anchor retailer, which would complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center and support smaller lifestyle retailers, a hotel, and other mixed uses. The project would include a second anchor in the form of a 275-room hotel with ground-floor dining and retail uses, which would include approximately 193,600 square feet.

Comment No. 55-3

Page 7, Paragraph 4 *“...the project’s various land uses would be developed as a combination of freestanding low- and high-rise structures and would incorporate smart growth and green principles. ... The project would incorporate a series on landscaped pedestrian walkways integrated with landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space throughout the interior of the site, and streetscape improvements along the perimeter of the project site.”*

Comment: It is a mischaracterization to claim that the project incorporates smart growth principles when it fails many of the 10 principles stated in volumes 1 and 2 of Getting to Smart Growth published by the Smartgrowth Network and the International City/County Management Association [<http://smartgrowth.org>]. It does mix land uses. It does not take advantage of compact building design for a majority of the site. It does not create a range of housing opportunities and choices. It only partly contributes to a walkable neighborhood. It only partly fosters a distinctive, attractive community with a strong sense of place. It does not preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas. Conceivably, it may strengthen and direct development towards existing communities. It does not provide although it does potentially support a variety of transportation choices. It does not seem to totally make the development decisions predictable and fair but it certainly seeks [sic] cost effective.

Response to Comment No. 55-3

The project would incorporate a number of smart growth principles. The majority of the project would be designed to achieve the standards of the Silver Rating under the USGBC's Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design (LEED®) green building program, or equivalent green building standards. The anchor retailer building would be designed to achieve the standards of LEED® Certified, or an equivalent green building standard, at minimum. The project would also be designed to meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles' Green Building Code. Thus, as described in more detail in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project would incorporate an environmentally sustainable design utilizing green building technologies that involve more resource-efficient modes of construction through energy efficiency, water conservation, environmentally preferable building materials, and waste reduction to create a building design that would be environmentally sustainable. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, specific sustainability features proposed as part of the project would include secure and covered bicycle storage areas for occupants, shower and changing facilities for hotel employees, and the provision of preferred parking to low-emitting (Zero Emission Vehicles) and fuel-efficient vehicles for the retail and office components of the project.

The project would greatly contribute to a more walkable environment compared to the existing pedestrian environment provided within and along the perimeter of the project site. The existing bus stops adjacent to the project site (particularly on Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard) would be physically improved with street furniture and amenities, such as new benches or shelters. In addition, a new transit stop along Topanga Canyon Boulevard would be provided. As shown in Figure II-28 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, new pedestrian paths would lead directly from bus stops at the perimeter of the site to the interior of the project site. These pathways would include the meandering sidewalks located within the landscape setback at the site perimeter and

dedicated pathways through the site (with lighting, landscaping, and seating). In addition, one option to locate the sidewalk along the retail frontage along Topanga Canyon Boulevard would allow pedestrians to stroll this “paseo” and be shielded from the highway by significant landscaping. From the Westfield Topanga Shopping Center to the north, a dedicated, tree-lined walking path would bring the pedestrian to the signalized intersection at Victory Boulevard. From this crosswalk, one could proceed directly into the project site.

As shown in Figures II-9, II-17, and II-18 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, landscaped, pedestrian-oriented, open-space areas would be provided within the central interior portion of the site. This landscaped, pedestrian-oriented, open-space area would include pedestrian seating, enhanced paving, planters, as well as landscaping that would include accent trees, as shown in Figure II-18 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Water features may also be provided within the open-space areas.

Comment No. 55-4

Regarding the encouragement of community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions, the community has only been consulted after the major decisions and site plan were complete. The community’s advice through the neighborhood council has been limited to the final look and finish of the project. No charrette or substantive public workshops were conducted prior to releasing a site plan and a notice of project.

Response to Comment No. 55-4

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 41-4 for a discussion of the public’s opportunity for input on the project.

Comment No. 55-5

Landscaped pedestrian walkways do not by themselves make a community walkable under smart growth principles. To be pedestrian-oriented, there must also be active uses incorporated/adjacent to the walkway. The pedestrian-oriented spaces of the project are really the only part that contributes for consideration as a “walkable neighborhood.”

Response to Comment No. 55-5

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 and Response to Comment No. 55-3 for a discussion of the project site’s walkability.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-6

Page 9, Last Paragraph *“The hotel building would have a maximum height of approximately 247.5 feet above grade...” and*

Page 10, Second Paragraph *“It is anticipated that the new office uses would be provided within one or two high-rise towers. The high-rise building(s) would have a maximum building height up to approximately 247.5 feet above grade...” and*

Page 10, Third Paragraph *“Approximately 14,250 square feet of community/cultural center uses would also be provided as part of the project. This space is anticipated to be provided within the interior of the site.”*

Comment: These statements are in contradiction to Tentative Tract Map No. 69943 in Figure IV.E-5 which states the lots are for 260 foot tall towers above grade with no mention of a second office tower. The tract map also states that the hotel, which is at the south perimeter of the project and not the interior, will include the community center.

The Owensmouth Parkway Guidelines [sic] in the Warner Center Specific Plan recommends uses like community center to be located on Owensmouth Avenue.

Response to Comment No. 55-6

As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the maximum height for the project site is 247.5 feet. Proposed Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 69943, shown in Figure IV.E-5, in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, if approved by the deputy advisory agency, will be revised as a condition of approval to indicate the maximum height of 247.5 feet for the project site. Please refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

The community center is not intended to be part of the hotel. While the location of the community center has not yet been determined, a community center space will be provided as part of the project and will be programmed and utilized consistent with a family-friendly environment. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 and Response to Comment No. 18-34 for more information regarding the proposed community center.

Comment No. 55-7**B. Parking and Site Access**

Page 11, Third Paragraph *“Vehicular access to and from the parking areas would be provided via driveways and ramps along adjacent streets...Additionally, a 30-foot wide internal roadway would be provided and would curve along the eastern boundary from Owensmouth Avenue to Erwin Street.”*

Comment: The proposed lengthy driveways are not streets with the multi-modal amenities and safety designs of streets. They do not bring local traffic into the site by improving community circulation and offering retailers the opportunity to be seen by passing traffic. Only retailers facing Topanga Canyon and Victory Boulevards have any opportunity to be seen.

The 30-foot roadway is really an alley, which is generally adequate for access by utility and service trucks, but is not a genuine comfortable direct access rout [sic] for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. The real purpose of this roadway is to only serve the fire department requirements and as such is a very poor implementation of access and underutilization of land that detracts from the project. Additionally this roadway may present problems for the adjacent properties with very few eyes on the street.

Response to Comment No. 55-7

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project’s primary vehicular and pedestrian passageways.

Comment No. 55-8**C. Height Zones**

Page 11 to 12 *“A height zone to limit maximum heights to 75 feet above grade would be established for much of the project site along Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue. Within the central portion of the project site where a parking structure is proposed, a height zone of 90 feet would be established. Along the western property line of the project site adjacent to Topanga Canyon Boulevard, a maximum height zone of approximately 100 feet above grade would be established. Within the more central portion of the project site (west and south of the 90 foot height zone) as well as near the southwestern corner of the the [sic] project site, maximum height zones of 247.5 feet above grade” [sic]*

Response to Comment No. 55-8

This comment providing the Commentor's summary of the height zone discussion within the Draft EIR is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-9

Comment: The proposed lengthy driveways are not streets with the multi-modal amenities and safety designs of streets. They do not bring local traffic into the site by improving community circulation and offering retailers the opportunity to be seen by passing traffic. Only retailers facing Topanga Canyon and Victory Boulevards have any opportunity to be seen.

The 30-foot roadway is really an alley, which is generally adequate for access by utility and service trucks, but is not a genuine comfortable direct access route [sic] for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. The real purpose of this roadway is to only serve the fire department requirements and as such is a very poor implementation of access and underutilization of land that detracts from the project. Additionally this roadway may present problems for the adjacent properties with very few eyes on the street.

Response to Comment No. 55-9

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-7.

Comment No. 55-10**D. Open Space Areas/Landscape Plan**

Page 12, First & Second Paragraph *"The project would also provide landscaped pedestrian walkways, landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas, and streetscape improvements along the project site's perimeter. Through the creation of such open space areas, the buildings and the landscape of The Village at Westfield Topanga would be integrated to provide for a pedestrian-oriented central space within Warner Center...Landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas would be provided within the central interior portion of the site. This landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space would include pedestrian seating, enhanced paving, planters, as well as landscaping that would include accent trees."*

Comment: The project is to be commended for the quality of the proposed landscaping but it is not just the quality that makes the landscape friendly and walkable as evidenced by

the landscaping at Westfield Topanga. The pedestrian-oriented space at the core of the retail shopping center part will be great for [sic] pedestrians. The pathways leading to it from the east are often very long, through surface parking or parking structures with very little in the way of diversions along their [sic] way. Several pathways are very long and straight, making the pedestrian very aware of how far they have to walk.

These landscaped open spaces at the perimeter best serve drivers. They drive along a beautiful landscape at much higher speed than pedestrians or wheelchairs. These landscaped long stretches break up the monotony of the roadway for drivers. At the speed of pedestrians, these long stretches are monotonous with destinations and points of interest along the way. The project is located on a super block. While they are walkable in the sense that they have a sidewalk, walkability in the field of urban design means a lot more. If one is not aware of how far they are walking because of the changing environment along the way and there are destinations along the way to where they might need something then that is walkable. The only walkable part of the project is what the Applicant calls pedestrian-oriented space at the retail core. I suppose from the Applicant's point of view, it wants to trap pedestrians at its core and make leaving as unpleasant as possible.

Response to Comment No. 55-10

The project has designed buildings along public streets to be pedestrian-scaled and of visual interest by incorporating design details, such as the articulation of building façades, the use of overhangs, multi-faced roof forms, and quality materials, to ensure that buildings are welcoming from the street. The project's Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue frontages will include landscaped setbacks with multi-use trails and tree-lined, meandering sidewalks, and the Topanga Canyon Boulevard frontage includes a multi-use trail within the landscaped setback and a sidewalk adjacent to either the public street frontage or the project's retail buildings. These pedestrian paths will also provide linkages to surrounding uses and connect to pedestrian paths and open space within the property.

The project is designed to break up large blocks by including internal roadways and pedestrian paths that traverse the site and align with Rapid Bus stops on Topanga Canyon Boulevard, existing driveways on Owensmouth Avenue, and the existing driveway for Westfield Topanga on Victory Boulevard. The project will also incorporate landscaped setbacks, multi-use trails, and sidewalks along Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Victory Boulevard, and Owensmouth Avenue, thus making this area more walkable for pedestrians.

Finally, the landscaped plaza area would feature amenities, such as seating, lighting, canopies, and special paving, that would mark the corner as a "gateway" element into the Warner Center area, as set forth in the Specific Plan. These will be shaded,

pedestrian-friendly areas which connect to other pedestrian amenities surrounding and within the project site. All of these features are designed to enhance the project site's walkability.

Comment No. 55-11

General Comment on this section: The issue of the proposed landscaping of open space and pathways is covered elsewhere in these comments. One point mentioned later is the issue of street furniture at bus stops where the City of Los Angeles has contracted with an advertising entity such that some bus stop locations have been chosen by this entity for standard street furniture with advertising panels, possibly CBS/Decaux, and the Applicant needs to check with the appropriate City Agency responsible for the contract.

Response to Comment No. 55-11

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-12

As far as trees for the site, Sycamore trees are native to the area and would be a good choice to complement the existing Sycamores. Some requirements should be put in the development agreement that only certified arborists are used to trim the trees and that they are trained to reach their full size and not be stunted in surface parking lots. This is true of all large canopy trees to be used on the site.

Response to Comment No. 55-12

Street trees would be planted consistent with Appendix A – Urban Design Guidelines of the Warner Center Specific Plan. Sycamores are one of several tree varieties proposed for the site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-13

While the project proposes a walking path between the project and the Westfield Topanga Shopping Center to the north, no mention is made of a bicycle route/multimodal pathway. To provide access equally to all modes of travel, expansion of the pathway to handle additional modes of transit such as bicycles, tricycles, Segways, scooters, personal electric vehicles, etc. should be considered.

Response to Comment No. 55-13

There will be a paved pathway between the project and Westfield Topanga. This pathway could handle bicycle traffic, as well as pedestrians. Note that it is legal in the City of Los Angeles for bicyclists to use the public sidewalks.

Comment No. 55-14**E. Architectural Design and Materials**

Page 14 Last Paragraph onto page 15 *“As discussed...consistent with the articulation requirements of the Specific Plan and in order to reduce the overall massing, the wall plane along Victory Boulevard would include recesses or modulations of the building façade. In addition the anchor retailer building would feature several projecting elements, such as canopies and articulated towers.”*

Comment: The Specific Plan requires a minimum 15' variation in the footprint from a birds-eye view. It is not clear that the emergency exits of the member-only retail anchor meet this requirement. It is also not clear that it meets this requirement for 15% of the wall given that the wall is over 200 feet in length. It is also not clear that the articulated towers are not illegally encroaching into the required setback. Since every building is on a separate lot in the proposed tract map, setback averaging should not apply. No mention is made that the retail anchor is on a raised pad along its Victory Boulevard frontage. Additionally, as the parking structure serves the retail anchor it is required to have similar architectural treatment as the retail anchor. Since it is longer than 800' on two façades, there should be similar recesses of at least 15' in depth along 120' of the façade.

Response to Comment No. 55-14

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-14 for more information regarding the retail building's consistency with the Specific Plan's articulation requirements. The canopy elements are permitted to project into the setback area, and the building wall and tower elements are not within the setback. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-9 regarding the elevation of the berm and anchor retail building. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan. Floor area averaging and lot coverage averaging are being requested, given that the project site will operate as a unified development on a unified development site.

The primary parking for the anchor retailer will be provided by the surface parking located adjacent to the building and not by the parking structure located in the central

interior portion of the site. Further, the Specific Plan only requires that the building façades of parking structures be compatible with the building it serves. The Specific Plan defines building façade as “The exterior wall of a building or structure which is within a horizontal angle of 45 degrees from any lot line adjoining a public street.” Therefore, since the proposed parking structure located in the central interior of the project site does not have a building façade, it is not subject to this requirement. However, the proposed parking structure will be compatible with the project’s buildings.

Comment No. 55-15

II. Project Description

A. Introduction

Page 136, Second Paragraph *“The project would incorporate smart growth principles and green building techniques. In addition, the design of the project would create a pedestrian-oriented environment that would include landscaped pedestrian walkways with landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space and streetscape improvements along the streets adjacent to the project site. Overall, the proposed improvements would integrate as well promote the future vitality of the shopping center uses in and around the site and improve the area as a walkable and transit-oriented community by combining retail, commercial, business, lodging and entertainment opportunities.”* [sic]

Comment: As stated earlier, it is a mischaracterization to claim that the project incorporates smart growth principles when it fails many of the 10 principles stated in volumes 1 and 2 of Getting to Smart Growth published by the Smartgrowth Network and the International City/County Management Association [<http://smartgrowth.org>].

The project does mix land uses but it does not take advantage of compact building design for a majority of the site. It also does not create a range of housing opportunities and choices. It only partly contributes to a walkable neighborhood in a select portion of the site. It only partly fosters a distinctive, attractive community with a strong sense of place on part of the project. It does not preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas. Conceivably, it may strengthen and direct development towards the surrounding existing communities. It does not provide, although it does potentially support, a variety of transportation choices. It does not seem to totally make the development decisions predictable and fair but it certainly seeks to be cost effective.

Response to Comment No. 55-15

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-3 for a discussion of the project's incorporation of smart growth principles.

Comment No. 55-16

Regarding the encouragement of community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions, it failed as the community has only been consulted after the major decisions and site plan were complete. The community's advice through the neighborhood council has been limited to the final look and finish of the project. No charrette or substantive public workshops were conducted prior to releasing a site plan and a notice of project.

Response to Comment No. 55-16

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 25-4 for a discussion of the public's opportunity for input on the project.

Comment No. 55-17

The project fails at connecting well to the local community and integrating the uses adjacent to the site, which it would need to do under smart growth. Combining the uses of the proposed project to improve the area as a walkable and transit oriented community is open to interpretation of the extent of the area or context of the project. Smart Growth would not have acres of surface parking in an urban context.

Response to Comment No. 55-17

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-3 for a discussion of the project's incorporation of smart growth principles.

Comment No. 55-18

Page 136, Third Paragraph *"The modifications are intended to provide an improved balance of land uses for the site. Specifically, the proposed modifications include converting a substantial portion of the previously approved office space and residential units included within Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 51449 to a mix of retail, restaurant and community cultural center uses, while decreasing the number of hotel rooms previously approved ..."* [sic]

Comment: While one can look at the proposed tract only and claim that it offers a better mix of uses, if one then looks at the three blocks of property owned by the Applicant, the

previously approved tract map balances the combined land uses better than the new proposal. It adds more commercial and retail adjacent to properties that are primarily exclusively retail. With the possible exception of the Community center, in terms of what is better overall for Warner Center, Tract Map No. 51449 is arguably better. A major problem with the proposed project is that it looks at itself in isolation.

Response to Comment No. 55-18

The Draft EIR also analyzes the environmental impacts associated with development of the project site under Tract Map No. 51449. This project is analyzed in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, as Alternative B – No Project/Development in Accordance with Existing Plans. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-19

Page 138, Second and Third Paragraph: *“As shown in the aerial photograph provided in the figure II-2 on page 139, the project vicinity is a suburban area. The Westfield Topanga shopping Center, which contains a variety of retail and restaurant uses, which contains a variety of retail and restaurant uses, is located across Victory Boulevard...Further south and southeast of the Westfield Promenade along Oxnard Street are the high-rise buildings that make up the skyline of Warner Center area. These high-rise buildings include the 16-story Marriott Hotel, the Warner Center towers that includes 6 high-rise office buildings between approximately 11 and 25 stories tall (the 25-story office building is the tallest in the area), and the 12-story Blue Cross building...The approximately 17-story Blue Shield of California twin buildings are located further to the east in the next block along Canoga Avenue.”*

Comment: It is a mischaracterization to call the vicinity suburban. Suburban is generally characterized by low level buildings and strongly residential whose residents commute to work in the urban centers, which is what Warner Center is. The characterization provided lists numerous high-rise buildings demonstrating that the vicinity is in fact an urban center. It is wrong and misleading to suggest that this is suburban for the purpose of justifying the use of suburban building forms. Warner Center is designates as a “Regional Center” in the General Plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-19

A survey of the existing uses in the vicinity, including adjacent to the site, shows this is a mostly suburban area, especially along Victory Boulevard and Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Erwin Street. There are exceptions which indicate an eventual transition to a more urban environment, but the urban core is concentrated along Oxnard and some

elements along Owensmouth Avenue and further to the east. As such, while the project vicinity includes several high-rise buildings, the overall character of the Warner Center area is appropriately characterized as “suburban,” which is defined as an outlying part of a city or town or a smaller community adjacent to or within commuting distance of a City.

Comment No. 55-20

D. Statement of Project Objectives

Comment: The following objectives appear to be written after the project was designed in order to justify the project.

Page 147, OBJECTIVE 1 *“Provide a distinctive, high-quality, mixed-use commercial environment that maximizes the variety of commercial uses on-site to support the needs of nearby residents and businesses, and attract future businesses, employers, and visitors to Warner Center.”*

Comment: The design if the project does as much deterrence to development as encouraging future development. A lot of retail in [sic] getting concentrated in one part of Warner Center to the detriment of getting it placed/dispersed throughout Warner Center to reduce VMT.

Response to Comment No. 55-20

The project site has been designated by the State as an Enterprise Zone where new development is encouraged and incentivized. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-21

Page 147, OBJECTIVE 2 *“Support immediate new investment in the project site and development of Warner Center as a high quality Regional Center destination by providing an anchor retailer at the project site in the short term.”*

Comment: In other words, the Applicant is desperate to build something and is proposing a poorly designed project to get it done when it could be done much better if the member-only anchor retailer would allow it.

Response to Comment No. 55-21

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a detailed discussion of the project's proposed design. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-22

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 3 *“Consistent with the applicant’s experience at other retail locations with successful retail programming, locate an anchor retailer at the project site in a high visibility adjacent to a public street to contribute to the initial draw for shoppers to visit the project and explore its diversity of users.”*

Comment: The applicant has many existing retail anchors at its adjacent projects that draw potential customers to the area of the project site. The lack of vision for the potential of the site forces the applicant to rely on more retail.

Response to Comment No. 55-22

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-23

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 4 *“Maximize the visibility of retail tenants through a project design that locates retail tenants in areas easily visible from adjacent public streets in order to attract a variety of high-quality retailers that will provide for the long term vitality of the project and Warner Center.”*

Comment: The project design fails this objective as there are no public streets through the project to give visibility to many of the retailers. This is here to justify the placement of the member-only anchor retailer with it back to the street on Victory Boulevard. The applicant operates many malls with no visibility of the retailers inside.

Response to Comment No. 55-23

As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed to maximize the visibility of retail tenants by locating retail along public street frontages. Specifically, as shown in Figure II-6, page 154, of the Draft EIR, all retail tenants would be visible from Victory Boulevard or Topanga Canyon Boulevard. In addition, the location of the anchor building provides for the most efficient development of the density

and mix of uses proposed. Please also refer to Topical No. 5 regarding project improvements along the Victory Boulevard frontage.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-24

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 5 *“Consistent with the Regional Center designation, utilize the large undeveloped and underdeveloped assemblage of parcels within the Community Plan Area to accommodate a large floor plate, single-level anchor retailer and hotel anchor tenant in order to ensure the presence of such uses in Warner Center to support the needs of existing and future residents; businesses, and visitors, and provide job opportunities and tax revenues derived from such anchor uses. [sic]*

Comment: Many large plate format retailers are adapting to multi-story facilities as part of a more compact sustainable urban community. This project works counter to that and proposes to perpetuate project sprawl and a large use of surface parking.

Response to Comment No. 55-24

An alternative project site plan with a two-story anchor retailer was analyzed as part of Alternative F – Modified Site Plans in the Draft EIR. This alternative project site plan was determined to have greater impacts with regard to Aesthetics/Visual Quality; Light, Shading, Land Use Consistency, Parking, and Access. Furthermore, as discussed in Section V, Alternatives, many large format retailers do not successfully operate on multiple levels, making it difficult to attract a tenant for this site design. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-25

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 6 *“Provide readily accessible and easily identifiable centrally located retail and parking facilities with shared parking, serving synergistic commercial uses including retail, office, and hotel, in order to provide visitors with easy and convenient retail business and destination experience, and encourage return visits.”*

Comment: This project has two parts, one part being the member-only retail with ancillary fuel station and tire store which is weakly synergistic with the other part, which has the hotel retail and office uses.

Response to Comment No. 55-25

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the integration of the project's Phase I uses, which will also include approximately 166,660 square feet of shopping center retail uses and approximately 32,075 square feet of restaurant uses, with the project's Phase II uses. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-26

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 7 *“Enhance Warner Center’s position as a Regional Center through the creation of a Regional Shopping Center with high –density, [sic] mixed-use commercial development including two anchor tenants at a location with existing transit services and public infrastructure that can accommodate such development, while preserving the nature and character of sensitive uses. (General Plan Framework Objective 3.4 and Specific Plan Objective 2.1).”*

Comment: Warner Center already has a Regional Shopping Center and an unbalanced [sic] distribution of retail that causes additional trips because the residential and retail are not getting mixed together. This project perpetuates the separation of retail from residential uses, excluding lodging.

Response to Comment No. 55-26

The project would locate new retail uses in close proximity to residential uses, and in close proximity to public transportation connecting residential uses to the site. The location of the proposed project would serve to reduce the length and number of trips that would otherwise be required if the project were located more distant from existing residential uses.

Comment No. 55-27

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 8 *“Maximize pedestrian accessibility to a variety of commercial uses by combining retail, office, lodging and entertainment opportunities at one site with existing transit connections (General Plan Framework Objective 3.16 and Specific Plan Objective 2.1)”*

Comment: This depends on how you are using the term maximize. Providing paths to the uses does help to maximize availability for pedestrian access but not as much as actually putting those uses closer to the primary transit points. It is almost a half-mile walk from the

center of the transit hub to the member-only anchor retail entrance and a third-of-a-mile walk to the hotel.

Response to Comment No. 55-27

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project site's connectivity to public transit and primary transit points.

Comment No. 55-28

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 9 *“Maximize the value of the site and the economic vitality of Warner Center and the City of Los Angeles through creation of a transit-supportive project with a variety of economically synergistic commercial uses and at least two anchor tenants, at an existing underutilized site that is responsive to market demands.*

Comment: The two anchor tenants is [sic] only thrown in to justify encroachment of required setbacks by virtue of qualifying as a “Regional Shopping Center” per the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-28

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion about providing an anchor retail tenant at the project site in response to market demands.

Comment No. 55-29

Page 148, OBJECTIVE 10 *“Provide tax revenues to the City of Los Angeles to support the City’s general fund in the short-term, and in the long-term, by including a mix of commercial uses and a project design that will attract high-quality anchor and general retailers, office tenants, and hotel operators.”*

Comment: This is a gratuitous objective to get the support of local politicians to override the concerns of poor design and damage to the future development of Warner Center in the vicinity of the project.

Response to Comment No. 55-29

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project's design. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-32 for additional information regarding the project's job creation and tax revenues.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-30

Page 149, OBJECTIVE 11 *“Maximize the creation of new permanent jobs by locating a variety of commercial uses on site, and maximize the creation of construction jobs, in order to strengthen the economic vitality of Warner Center.*

Comment: This is a gratuitous objective to get the support of local politicians to override the concerns of poor design and damage to the future development of Warner Center in the vicinity of the project. The money spent on the construction jobs will primarily leave the community of Warner Center and be spent elsewhere. So how does it strengthen the vitality of Warner Center. [sic]

Response to Comment No. 55-30

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 19-32 for additional information regarding the project’s job creation and tax revenues, and the project site’s designation as an Enterprise Zone by the State of California in order to stimulate business growth and increase employment opportunities.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-31

General Comments on Objectives: Several Objectives are selectively given to make it appear that the Applicant wants to be supportive of the Community Plan. In reality, they are chosen to support the project and were not chosen before the project was designed. If there was intent to serve the Community Plan, why leave out:

Objective/Policy 1-1.1 Maintain an adequate supply and distribution of multi-family residential housing opportunities in the Community Plan Area.

Objective/Policy 1-2.1 Locate higher residential densities near commercial centers and major bus routes where public service facilities utilities and topography will accommodate this development.

Objective/Policy 1-4.2 Promote mixed use housing projects in pedestrian oriented areas.

Objective/Policy 2-3.3 Require that the first-floor street-frontage of structures, including mixed-use projects and parking structures located in pedestrian-oriented districts, incorporate commercial uses. (The project professes that the project is pedestrian-oriented but doesn't follow this policy.)

Objective/Policy 5-1.3 Require development in major opportunity sites to provide public open space.

Objective/Policy 14-1.1 Assure that local bicycle routes are identified and linked with routes of neighboring areas of the City. (Applicant should be seeking to provide bike route on Victory Boulevard to the Orange Line and not just rely on the transit hub.)

Response to Comment No. 55-31

Objectives/Policies 1-1.1, 1-2.1, and 1-4.2 cited above were not included in the project's land use analysis because these policies apply to residential projects, and no housing is proposed as part of the project. Consistent with Objective/Policy 2-3.3, the project would include commercial uses within the first floors of all the project's street frontage structures. The project would also incorporate meandering sidewalks and multi-use trails along the project's street frontages to create a pedestrian-oriented environment. As further described in Response to Comment 17-2, the project would provide acres of open space on-site accessible to the public, consistent with Objective/Policy 5-1.3. While Objective/Policy 14-1.1 does not apply to stand-alone developments, the project would provide multi-use trails on the project site and would provide pedestrian linkages to surrounding blocks.

Comment No. 55-32

F. Description of Proposed Project

Page 149, First Paragraph *"The proposed uses would be consistent with the Regional Shopping Center designation and would include two primary anchors, the anchor retailer within the northern portion of the site and the hotel within the southern portion of the site...retail kiosks would not exceed a total of approximately 4, 000 square feet."*

Comment: The sole need to mention the Regional Shopping Center designation is to qualify for setback encroachment.

Consideration should be given to whether the intent of open space is met when the presence of retail kiosks turns the open space around the kiosks into additional retail space. There does not appear to be a mention in the report as to whether the calculation

of retail space extending from the footprint of the kiosk or is only the kiosk footprint calculated in the 4,000 square feet.

Response to Comment No. 55-32

As stated in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, retail kiosks would not exceed a total of 4,000 square feet. This would include all areas encompassed by the kiosks. The 4,000 square feet of retail kiosks is not included as part of the project's open space area.

Comment No. 55-33

Page 149, Second Paragraph *“Consistent with its established business formula, the Applicant has recognized that anchor retailers are a key component in the successful operation and economic sustainability of its existing adjacent properties...As a practical matter, the Applicant is limited to those potential anchors which are willing to enter into agreements for immediate participation in this project.”*

Comment: In the DEIR, the Applicant equivocates between its adjacent properties being independent projects ignoring their adjacency or being mutually sustaining as a regional retail center. Which is it? The common man would agree that the numerous anchor stores in the adjacent projects serve the need for an anchor retailer since the project is located in between them.

While the limited number of potential anchors may be true, Warner Center already serves as a regional center with plenty of regional retail, which the Applicant already provides. The potential harm of this project does not rise to the level of overriding consideration to allow the requirements of the anchor retail tenant to surpass the requirements of the municipal codes, especially when there are alternatives that can fit the anchor retailer on the site, if the tenant were to compromise for the benefit of the community.

Response to Comment No. 55-33

The project does not conflict with or override the requirements of the Municipal Code or Specific Plan; none of the applications seek an exception to the site's zoning requirements. A number of project alternatives have been analyzed as part of the Draft EIR, including Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, which analyzed modified site plans proposed by the community. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-34

Page 150, Top Paragraph *“However, [sic] the agreement has contingencies including the requirements to obtain approvals for the anchor store in accordance to Figure II-% [sic] on page 151 below.”*

Comment: Again, while this may be true, Warner Center already serves as a regional center with plenty of regional retail. The potential harm of this site plan with respect to proper development in the area does not rise to the level of overriding consideration to allow the requirements of the anchor retail tenant to surpass the requirements of the community, especially when the tenant has made compromises in other communities when necessary to do so. The prospective retailer has demonstrated in communities across the world that it can utilize a modified building typology when necessary. The reluctance on the part of the retailer shows disrespect for the community in which it seeks to desperately take advantage of the demographics of the market through relocation of an existing store.

Response to Comment No. 55-34

The project would be consistent with the vision for the Warner Center area set forth by adopted plans. Specifically, as discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the project conforms to the Specific Plan and the project would be consistent with the land use designations and the intent of the goals, objectives and policies set forth in the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan and the General Plan Framework Element. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-33 for a discussion of alternative site plans evaluated as part of the Draft EIR. The design of the anchor retail building has been modified significantly from its standard form to incorporate additional articulation and a variety of materials and colors to make the façade visually interesting and attractive. Please refer to Figures III-6 through III-9 of Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the design of the project and proposed anchor retail building. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-35

Page 150, First Paragraph *“The project includes an option to convert a portion...of shopping center retail space to a...2,200 seat movie theatre.”*

Comment: A movie theatre complex can be considered an entertainment anchor so the member-only retail anchor is not absolutely necessary. The primary factor is the member-only anchor allows for leasing a large amount of space in one contract for the convenience of the applicant. It has not been shown that an alternative project focused on inviting

public/open spaces would not be an equal or better draw and serve the needs of the community better. The DEIR shows that the theatre would not be a significant impact. The point is that the proposed anchor is not the only type of anchor that will make this site successful, and therefore it should not receive a status of getting overriding consideration.

Response to Comment No. 55-35

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion about providing an anchor retail tenant at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-36

Page 152, Table II-3

Comment: The proposed Project Development Summary Table lists a proposed grocery store. This would better serve as an excellent retail anchor for the project, as there has been much recent market-rate residential development, which needs a local grocery store. There is currently no grocery store in Warner Center, although there are specialty stores selling food items. Nationwide there are many supermarket chains that are capable of working within mixed-use urban-typology buildings. The need for supermarkets will only grow as Warner Center develops. Even Walmart is placing downsized stores focusing on groceries in urban sites. A Google search will confirm that many “big-box” brand are downsizing and capable of operating in urban vertical mixed-use buildings without the benefit of the amount of parking proposed for this project.

Response to Comment No. 55-36

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion about providing an anchor retail tenant at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-37

1. Phase 1

Page 161, First Full Paragraph *“These uses are permitted by-right within the Property’s (WC)C2 and (WC)C4 Zones and require a conditional Use Permit only for the purposes of expanding the hours of operation otherwise permitted by the LAMC and meeting certain design requirements.”*

Comment: As discussed previously and later, the project does not meet these design requirements without getting exceptions.

Response to Comment No. 55-37

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-16 for a discussion of the project's automotive uses, which are permitted by-right in the project's (WC)C2 zone.

Comment No. 55-38

Page 163, Last Paragraph *"As shown in Figure II-5 on page 151, retail uses would be linked to the other uses within the project site via landscaped pedestrian walkways. In addition, parking for the shopping center retail and restaurant uses constructed as Phase 1 would be provided within the new parking structure, grade plus one level, and within a series of surface parking areas located throughout the southern and western portions of the project site."*

Comment: Per discussions in public meetings with the Planning, Land Use and Mobility Committee of the Neighborhood Council, it was stated by Jackie Frank of Costco, that the ground plus one level parking spaces in the parking structure are needed by the member-only anchor for customers and employees and it should be disclosed leaving only surface parking for the shopping center retail.

The referenced Figure does not show pedestrian walkways within or at the perimeter of the unimproved surface parking and it marks an entrance on Erwin, which is not depicted as such. Necessary sidewalks through out the surface parking areas development of the entry through removal of the vacant retail structure should be required as part of Phase 1. No pedestrian facilities are provided from the access point to the adjacent property with CostPlus. Additionally, a time limit must be set by which time the required trees of 1 per 4 spaces are required in the event that Phase 2 is delayed for a time beyond 4 years.

Response to Comment No. 55-38

As discussed and illustrated in Topical Response No. 5, and illustrated in Figures II-28 and II-29 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project has been designed to promote pedestrian access throughout and around the project site. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-66 for a discussion of the trees that would be planted in the surface parking areas as part of Phase I.

Comment No. 55-39**2. Phase 2**

Page 164, Second Paragraph *“As part of Phase 2, the parking structure within the central portion of the site constructed as part of Phase 1 would be expanded to five plus one ground levels. This parking structure would be integrated with the new uses within Phase 2 via pedestrian walkways and landscape open space areas as shown in Figurell-6.” [sic]*

Comment: This does not disclose that there would be pedestrian bridges for pedestrians to avoid the open spaces linkages and it does not state that there would be parking in the office building connected by bridges to the parking structure.

Response to Comment No. 55-39

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding refinements to the site plan that have been made to improve circulation, including access to the parking structure. While pedestrian bridges may be provided within the site, such bridges would not be designed to replace open-space linkages.

Comment No. 55-40

Page 166, First Paragraph *“Approximately 14,250 square feet of community/cultural center uses would be provided as part of the project. This space is anticipated to include flexible meeting rooms and spaces to be used for various community functions. These uses are anticipated to be provided within the interior of the site.”*

Comment: This is contradicted by the tentative tract map provided in the DEIR, that states the hotel includes a community center. The amount of space nor the type of space to be provided has not been discussed with members of the community as far as I know. This should be undertaken before approval is given. There is no assessment of the space as to how it meets the needs of the community. Why is there not a comparison provided to existing community centers in nearby communities determining the use quality of the community center that is offered.

Response to Comment No. 55-40

The community/cultural center proposed as part of the project will not be located in the proposed hotel. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 and Response to Comment No. 18-34 for more information regarding the project's proposed community center.

Comment No. 55-41**3. Parking and Site Access**

Page 168, Top Paragraph *“This parking structure would be integrated with or in close proximity to the office and hotel buildings.”*

Comment: Again, this does not disclose that there would be pedestrian bridges for pedestrians to [sic] it does not state that there would be parking in the office building connected by bridges to the parking structure. It also does not state that there might be an office tower over the parking structure, which could be done under the proposed height zones for the project. The 247.5-foot zone overlaps the parking structure. What are the implications for additional development on this structure under the proposed new Warner Specific Plan?

Response to Comment No. 55-41

No office uses are proposed over a parking structure. The 247.5-foot height zone overlaps the parking structure in the center of the site to allow for flexibility to locate the office or hotel building closer to the center of the site. Refer to Response to Comment No. 55-39 regarding pedestrian bridges.

Comment No. 55-42

General comment: The proposed driveways are inadequate for local circulation in the long term context. The future development of the super-block including adjacent properties is hampered by the site plan proposed. In many parts of the site the pedestrians and cyclists are not adequately served. The 30-foot roadway is not adequate as it lacks sidewalks, especially when it connects to a CostPlus driveway and to Erwin St.

Based on Figure II-6 Conceptual Site Plan – Phase 2, it is unclear whether east-bound traffic on Erwin can make left turns into the driveway. Given the future increase in traffic from other projects that would require a raised median or if one is required by the new specific plan, a pork chop should be required at the Erwin entrance and the traffic study should not rely on using this entrance. A regular street entrance at the middle of the block at the CostPlus Driveway would better serve the long-term circulation needs of the community and makes for greater permeability of the block.

Response to Comment No. 55-42

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for additional information regarding the adequacy of the project's driveways. The traffic study assumed that the Erwin Street driveway would function as a right-turn entry and exit only; no left-turns into and out of the site were assumed. LADOT has requested the installation of a "pork chop" treatment to restrict the prohibited movements. The driveway to Cost Plus is not owned or controlled by the Applicant and therefore project traffic could not be assigned in/out of this location. The Project traffic analysis shows that the Project traffic can be adequately served without using the Cost Plus driveway. This driveway will provide access to the Erwin corridor and will take pressure off the surrounding streets as suggested in the comment.

Comment No. 55-43**4. Height Zones**

Page 168, First Paragraph *"...maximum height zones of 247.5 feet above grade would be established in accordance with Section 10.A.2(b)(2) of the Warner Center Plan."*

Comment: Besides stating the reference, for the average citizen, state that an additional %50 [sic] height is allowed on top of the 165' limit for the zone when there is a commensurate 50% increase in open space. It should also state how that additional open space is to be accounted for and whether it is quality space that won't be redeveloped later, such as surface parking.

Response to Comment No. 55-43

As stated in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the Specific Plan permits any project to seek a height increase, as long as the project provides a proportional increase in open space. The project will be providing a 50 percent increase in the required open space, in conjunction with the project's requested height increase. Since the Specific Plan requires that the project site include a minimum of 30 percent open-space area, a 50 percent increase in the site's open space means that the project site must provide at least 45 percent open space. The project site will include approximately 50 percent open space, thus exceeding this requirement. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-13 and Response to Comment No. 17-2 for more information regarding the project's open-space areas and consistency with the Specific Plan's open space requirements.

Comment No. 55-44

Page 170, Top Paragraph *"...it is anticipated that project buildings would not actually fill the entire envelope of the height zones."*

Comment: While flexibility is needed for the maximum height design, the DEIR depicts substantially less development than these height zones would allow along the periphery of the project. The issue of concern is that the actual façades proposed do not create an adequate street wall to create the appropriate outdoor room, based on the dimensions of the highways on Topanga Canyon and Victory Boulevards.

This project perpetuates the divisiveness these wide boulevards without commensurate street walls cause in the community. Is this a reason that the Applicant still sees its properties as separate centers? Calling this project as the Village at Westfield Topanga is a stretch because there is still no perception of a connection created between the properties, especially with a 450' back of an anchor facing the Topanga Shopping Center [sic]

Response to Comment No. 55-44

The height zones are provided so that there is some flexibility in the ultimate design of the street edge buildings; however, the maximum heights permitted by the height zones are permitted by the Municipal Code and Specific Plan. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more detail regarding the project's site plan design. The project's streetscapes would include new meandering sidewalks and multi-use trails surrounding the project site, and these paths would connect to the rest of the project's uses internal to the site, as well as to uses in the surrounding area. The new multi-use trails and pedestrian paths would also provide connections to a number of public transit facilities within the local vicinity. Pedestrians crossing Victory Boulevard in the mid-block would enter the site along an enhanced sidewalk that opens into the anchor retailer entry courtyard. This entry courtyard would integrate the anchor retailer with the other mixed uses by connecting directly with the retail open-space area while maintaining easy access to the central parking facility. As shown in Figure II-19 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, at the entry to the anchor retailer, an active pedestrian courtyard and outdoor food court would create an activity node within the project site. The location, design and features of this area would serve as both a pedestrian-oriented central space and a logical extension of both the existing and proposed retail corridors. From the Westfield Topanga Shopping Center to the north of the project site, a dedicated, tree-lined walking path would provide pedestrians with direct access to the project site. In addition, pedestrians at the Westfield Promenade to the south of the project site can enter the project site from either of the two Erwin Street entries, providing direct access to the project's hotel and the southern end of the project's retail. The project site will also include three "gateway" corners, or shaded mini-plaza areas, for pedestrians to stop and rest. These gateway corners will be located at the corner of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue, Victory Boulevard and Topanga Canyon Boulevard, and Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Erwin Street. These mini plaza areas will consist of special paving, seating, lighting, canopies, and landscaped walls which will form a gateway into the Warner Center area, as set forth in the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 55-45**5. Open Space Areas/Landscape Plan**

Page 170, First and Second Paragraph *“Through the creation of such open space areas, the buildings and the landscape...would be integrated to provide for a pedestrian-oriented central space...This landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space would include pedestrian seating, enhanced paving, planters, as well as landscaping that would include pedestrian walkways both within and along the perimeter of the project site to facilitate pedestrian access though out the site as well as between adjacent uses.”*

Comment: The site plan utilizes open space poorly in terms of creating a vibrant social place where people want to be. All of the perimeter landscaped spaces are designed to keep people moving as fast as possible or not come at all. There is little evidence that there is any desire for people to linger or for any social activity around the perimeter to make the site friendly and inviting for pedestrians from adjacent properties. The perimeter is devoted to the automobile.

The limited amount of pedestrian-oriented space is centrally internal to the site and the DEIR states that. The small amount of pedestrian-oriented space, especially in Phase 1 is not enough for the project to become a social scene. The spaces provided are dimensionally indoor spaces that are cluttered with kiosks that turn the open space into retail space, just like Westfield does in its malls.

The allocation of pedestrian-oriented space really demonstrates the mall-dominated typology and expertise of the Applicant. The project is very weak in PlaceMaking. There is little opportunity to create social activities in this plan. As Warner Center grows, this plan is inadequate to be an urban, downtown, happening-space handling greater numbers of people. The peripheral space is not conceived to have opportunities suitable for conversion into pedestrian-oriented space without the demolition of retail spaces.

Response to Comment No. 55-45

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project's pedestrian oriented open space. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-46

Page 170, Third Paragraph *“At the entry to the anchor retailer, an active pedestrian courtyard and outdoor food court would create an activity node within the project site...The*

location, design and features of this area would serve as both a pedestrian-oriented central space and a logical extension of both the existing and proposed retail corridors. Pedestrians crossing Victory Boulevard in the mid-block would enter the site along an enhanced sidewalk that opens into the anchor retailer courtyard. This entry courtyard would be centered at the end of the retail open space area and adjacent to the central parking garage.”

Comment: First, calling the entry area to the anchor retailer a courtyard is using the term loosely. The poor quality eat-and-run activity node is misaligned with the central pedestrian-oriented [sic] space making fo [sic] a weak connection to that space. It has a greater connection to the driveway between Crate’N’Barrel and the new retail because it faces directly on to it.

The space does not face Victory at all to invite pedestrians from Victory Boulevard because the activity area (seating) is mostly obscured by an extension of the building, presumably the food service area. Following the customary practice of other Costco sites, the food service windows will be facing away from Victory Boulevard towards the anchor’s entrance. Pedestrians entering from Victory Boulevard are actually coming in through the back door, so-to-speak. A good percentage of the view from this activity node looks onto a primary driveway with associated traffic or the surface parking lot across the driveway or a parking structure up to 90’ in height.

The main activity noticed from the central activity space would be the entrance to the anchor and not the food court activity unless one were actually at the end of the space. Touting the connectivity to the retail corridor here is a stretch and connected primarily by its adjacency and not by design and this is the strongest link between the anchor store and its ancillary uses. The cohesiveness is very weak.

Response to Comment No. 55-46

The open space between the anchor retail building and the adjacent retail areas was reorganized to improve the usability and accessibility of this area. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5, for more information regarding this modified site plan and the project’s Victory Boulevard entry courtyard. This entry court and outdoor food area will be highly visible from Victory Boulevard, but also appropriately protected from the noise and pollution of this busy highway, thus allowing for a better pedestrian-oriented experience.

Comment No. 55-47

Page 176, Top Paragraph *“The paths would also include a shaded plaza area at the corner for pedestrians to stop and rest. The landscaped plaza area would feature*

amenities such as seating, lighting, canopies and special paving that would mark the corner as a 'gateway' element. Consistent with the Specific Plan goals of encouraging pedestrian activity along the corridors, these paths would connect to the rest of the project's uses internal to the site, and connect to the surrounding area."

Comment: There are no pedestrian serving land uses along these paths. Other than the transit sopt, [sic] the first pedestrian serving land use at the anchor retail in over 750' away. The Warner Center Specific Plan desires active pedestrian-serving uses along the Owensmouth Parkway, which includes the corner at Victory Boulevard.

Gateway implies that there is an entrance. There are no entrances to the project at these 'gateway' elements. Gateway elements usually come in pairs with the entrance between them. Are these gateway elements framing entrances to the project or a shopping district in which case there should be the other element of the pair across the street? Are these gateway elements proposed for the purposes of branding the project?

Response to Comment No. 55-47

The project's streetscapes would include new meandering sidewalks and multi-use trails surrounding the project site, and these paths would connect to the rest of the project's uses internal to the site, as well as to uses in the surrounding area. The project's gateway elements are intended to mark and provide more definition to the corners of the project site and provide amenities for pedestrians using the new sidewalks, such as seating, lighting, canopies, and special paving. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for an additional discussion of the project site's pedestrian connection from the street fronts to uses internal to the project site.

Comment No. 55-48

Page 176, Middle Paragraph *"The existing bus stops adjacent to the project site (particularly on Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard) would be physically improved with street furniture and amenities, such as new benches or shelters."*

Comment: It should be noted that the City of Los Angeles has entered into a contract that allows an advertising firm to install specific street furniture at the bus stops of its choosing. Applicant will need to work with the city agency responsible for the contract to ensure that the installation of upgraded street furniture is acceptable at these locations and that it does not want to place advertising at these stops.

Response to Comment No. 55-48

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-11.

Comment No. 55-49

Page 178, Last Paragraph *“...the project would provide a minimum 15 foot wide landscaped setback area.”*

Comment: It should be mentioned that the actual required setbacks are normally greater and that the 15-foot setback is allowed only by virtue of the project being designated (qualifying) as a Regional Shopping Center.

Response to Comment No. 55-49

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-35 for a discussion of the project’s consistency with the setback requirements of the Specific Plan.

Comment No. 55-50

Page 178, Last Paragraph *These pathways would include the meandering sidewalks located within the landscape setback at the site perimeter, sidewalks within the project site itself, and pathways through the site (with lighting, landscaping and seating). In addition, the proposed option to locate the sidewalk internally along the retail frontage along Topanga Canyon Boulevard, would allow pedestrians to stroll this ‘paseo’ and be shielded from the highway by significant landscaping. From the Westfield Topanga shopping center to the north, a dedicated, tree-lined walking path would bring the pedestrian to the signalized intersection at Victory Boulevard. ” [sic]*

Comment: These pathways are generally treated elsewhere in the listing of my comments as not satisfying the need for great walkability due to their length without pedestrian serving uses. The sidewalk along the Topanga Canyon Boulevard facing retail is not an option because it is needed for access to the retail by pedestrians – unless there will be no retail frontages facing the boulevard. “Paseo” is only accurate if there would be an enhanced wider sidewalk with amenities and pedestrian serving uses that would encourage a stroll as implied by the word “paseo.” It is unclear if the significant landscaping that shields the pedestrians is between the sidewalk and the surface parking. If not, it should be mentioned that the surface parking separates the pedestrians from the landscaping including a multi-use [sic] pathway that is shielding the pedestrians from the traffic.

The new pathway at Westfield Topanga will certainly dress up the surface parking for that property. But it suffers the same lack of walkability as the pathways through the surface parking of the proposed project. On the bright side, the entrance to Sears at Westfield Topanga is around 200' closer to the anchor retail entrance than the bus stop at Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue.

Response to Comment No. 55-50

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project's walkability and pedestrian paths.

Comment No. 55-51

6. Architectural Design and Materials

Page 178, Last Paragraph *"...consistent with the articulation requirements of the Specific Plan and in order to reduce the apparent overall massing of the anchor building, the wall plane along Victory Boulevard would include several full height setbacks of the buildings [sic] façade and a variety of projecting canopies and tower elements."*

Comment: As discussed elsewhere, it is questionable that the recesses meet the requirement of at least 15' variation from a birds-eye view. It is also questionable that the 15% of wall length being setback is also met. Additionally, the tower elements encroach into the setback more than what should be allowed, which is questionable because this façade does not qualify as pedestrian serving as there is no public entrance facing the boulevard nor any windows. It is also likely that due to the building being significantly raised above the grade level of the meandering sidewalk, there are no ADA accessible entrances, only emergency exits.

Response to Comment No. 55-51

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-14. All ADA access requirements will be met, pursuant to federal law.

Comment No. 55-52

IV.E Environmental Impact Analysis – Land Use

2. Environmental Setting

b. Regulatory Framework

(1) Local Plans and Applicable Policies

(a) City of Los Angeles General Plan

(i) Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan

Page 458, Last Footnote 9 *“The Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills - West Hills Community Plan is anticipated to begin update in 2013/2014”*

Comment: All Community Plans that have not been started are on indefinite hold due to lack of funding and this community plan is near the bottom of the list.

Response to Comment No. 55-52

The Canoga Park plan update is not currently funded in the City’s budget and is not scheduled for inclusion on the Department of City Planning's work program at this time. This modification has been made to the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 55-53

3. Environmental Impact

b. Analysis of Project Impacts

(1) Local Plans and Applicable Policies

(a) City of Los Angeles General Plan

(i) Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan

Table IV.E-1

Page 495, Objective 2-4 *“...the project would be generally consistent with the design guidelines and development standards...”*

Comment: This glosses over the fact that the design is inconsistent with some of the most important guidelines regarding walkability, entrances on the street, and having pedestrian serving uses along Owensmouth Ave. This statement is potentially deceptive to the

untrained reader by implying that it really complies with very important guideline and there is no significant impact when there really is.

Response to Comment No. 55-53

A detailed analysis of the project's consistency with the Community Plan, the Warner Center Specific Plan and other local and regional plans is provided in Table IV.E-1 in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. In addition, an analysis of the project's consistency with the design policies of the Community Plan is provided in Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR. As discussed in these sections, while the project would be partially consistent with a few of the individual policies or guidelines within these plans, the project would be consistent with the majority of the policies and guidelines in these plans, as well as the primary goals of these plans.

Comment No. 55-54

(ii) The Framework Element of the General Plan

Table IV.E-2

Page 498, Policy 3.13 *"...the project would include a series of landscaped pedestrian walkways, landscaped pedestrian-oriented open space areas, and streetscape improvements along the perimeter of the project site."*

Comment: This claim twists the intent of the policy when it equates landscapes walkways and streetscape with parklands, trails, neighborhood parks, and urban open space. Much of the project's open space is driveway or surface parking. The stated qualified open space for the project is not the intent of the policy. See Policy 3.10.5 which is more appropriate.

Response to Comment No. 55-54

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-13 for a discussion of the project's consistency with the Specific Plan's open space requirements. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, the project site would provide over two acres of pedestrian gathering spaces. These spaces will include a combination of walkable paseos linking the retail, office, hotel, and parking uses, and amply landscaped and shaded courtyards, which will provide active areas for special events, dining, seating areas, and other amenities to enhance the pedestrian experience. The pedestrian-oriented open spaces will include pedestrian seating, enhanced paving, and planters, as well as landscaping that will include

accent trees. Thus, as stated in the Draft EIR, the project would be consistent with Policy 3.1.3 of the General Plan Framework.

Comment No. 55-55

Page 499, Objective 3.2 *“Development of the project’s proposed mix of commercial uses would expand the land use diversity within the area and serve the needs of the community.”*

Comment: This is far fetched [sic] as most of the proposed uses are in the area with the exception of the grocery store, so it’s true on a technicality of one use. As far as spatial distribution the project runs counter to this goal as it further concentrates similar uses at the expense of other areas that will continue to drive further than they might otherwise do. This again is another instance of twisting the intent to the purposes of the applicant. While transit users would reduce the VMT of some visitors, others are traveling further because all the retailers are concentrated in one location and not spatially distributed per the objective.

Page 501, Objective 3.4 *“Development of the project’s proposed mix of commercial uses would expand the land use diversity within the area and serve the needs of the community.”*

Comment: This is far fetched [sic] as most of the proposed uses are in the area with the exception of the grocery store, so it’s true on a technicality of one use. As far as spatial distribution the project runs counter to this goal as it further concentrates similar uses at the expense of other areas that will continue to drive further than they might otherwise do. This again is another instance of twisting the intent to the purposes of the applicant. While transit users would reduce the VMT of some visitors, others are traveling further because all the retailers are concentrated in one location and not spatially distributed per the objective. Multi-family residential would be a use that is not on the block, or the ones to the north and south. That use would better fulfill the objective of diversifying the uses by adding multifamily residential over a grocery store compared to adding more retail.

Response to Comment No. 55-55

In accordance with Objective 3.2 of the General Plan Framework, development of the project’s proposed mix of commercial uses would expand the land use diversity within the area and serve the needs of the community as stated in the Draft EIR. Specifically, a variety of retail and restaurant uses would be provided along with office uses, a hotel, a grocery store, community/cultural uses, and a potential theater. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the location of this proposed mix of commercial uses within close proximity to existing

residential uses, places of employment, services, and numerous public transit facilities, such as the Warner Center Transit Hub and the Metro Orange Line Canoga Station, would provide opportunities for the use of alternative modes of transportation. In addition, by locating the proposed uses within an underutilized site in a developed area rather than locating the uses in an undeveloped area, the location and proposed mix of uses would promote an improved quality of life by facilitating a reduction in vehicle trips and miles traveled. In addition, by locating new retail uses in proximity to other retail uses a reduction in vehicle miles traveled would be expected as opportunities to shop at one general location at a variety of retail stores would be provided.

Comment No. 55-56

Page 502, Policy 3.10.3 “...the northern portion of the project site along Victory Boulevard between Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue is designated as a pedestrian priority district.”

Comment: The intent of this is to have retail facing the street, not to have a pedestrian-oriented zone internal to the project. The project fails this objective by having the fueling station along Victory and the member-only anchor with its back to the street and no entrance or windows on Victory Boulevard. There should be active uses along the Victory frontage per the policy.

Response to Comment No. 55-56

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Victory Boulevard would be activated through numerous streetscape improvements that would include pedestrian amenities.

Comment No. 55-57

(iii) Warner Center Specific Plan

Page 508, Purpose 2F “Encourage mixed-use development within Warner Center in accordance with the City’s goal to improve the jobs/housing relationship ...”

Comment: This project can be seen counter to the City’s goal because there is no housing much less affordable housing to be added commensurate with the creation of jobs many of which are low paying retail jobs. The citizen advisory committee has become concerned that the northwest corner of Warner Center is heavy on retail and deficient on housing. This situation of separation of uses like this increase the need for motor vehicle trips. This project does not help to balance the jobs/housing balance in Warner Center.

Doing this for Warner Center is critical to achieving the growth goals in the revised specific plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-57

As discussed above in Response to Comment No. 55-55, the project would provide for a mix of uses within the project site. The proposed uses are consistent with the designated commercial use for the site set forth in the Warner Center Specific Plan and the Canoga Park–Winnetka–Woodland Hills–West Hills Community Plan. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-58

Page 509, Second Paragraph *“In particular, the project’s design and proposed streetscape improvements would be consistent with the Specific Plan requirements regarding Owensmouth Parkway.”*

Comment: The project meets the landscape guidelines but it is a gross misrepresentation with respect to land uses. While the proposed plaza for pedestrians and transit riders fits the goals, the fueling station does not meet the land use guidelines for Owensmouth Parkway. It is hardly a pedestrian serving use. The title of the appropriate section in the Specific Plan reads Land Uses: Retail/Restaurants, Community Facilities, Public Plazas. Furthermore, it then states, “the activities and spaces ...should be street-oriented, rather than internal focused within the development.” The gas station is member-only, not public, and it is hidden, not street-oriented. Hiding a fuel station behind a minimal transit plaza to say that there is a pedestrian serving use between the station and Owensmouth needs to be scrutinized in regard to the intent of the plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-58

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-43 and Section IV.A, Aesthetics, Views, Light and Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR regarding the project’s consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines.

Comment No. 55-59**Table IV.E-3**

Page 512, 10 F. Landscaped Setbacks and Pedestrian serving uses *“All setbacks would include a minimum 15-foot landscaped setback, after which surface parking may be provided as permitted for Regional Shopping Centers such as the project.”*

Comment: The fueling station is not surface parking. Cars may stop momentarily, they are not stopped for long periods nor is the fueling station striped as surface parking. The Fueling Station is an illegal encroachment into the 40’ setback required for Owensmouth Avenue and 25 feet for Victory Boulevard. It also is not a pedestrian serving use that would be allowed to encroach to within 25’ of the property line.

Response to Comment No. 55-59

The fueling station is setback 40 feet from Owensmouth Avenue, consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan. Please see Figure II-20 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 55-60

Page 513, 10 H. Owensmouth Parkway *“...the project’s urban design and proposed streetscape improvements would be consistent with these Specific Plan requirements addressing Owensmouth Parkway.”*

Comment: Again, the project may fit the landscape intents of the Owensmouth Parkway but the proposed land use is contrary to the Parkway guidelines.

Response to Comment No. 55-60

Please refer to Response to Comment 17-17 for a discussion of the project’s consistency with the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines, included in Appendix E of the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 55-61

Page 513, Last Paragraph (Bullet) *A goal of the draft Specific Plan is to support Transit Oriented Development which includes projects having at least one primary entrance located on a public street or public accessible private street that is within walking distance of transit station or stops.”*

Comment: The entrance to the member-only retail anchor is from a “driveway” and described as such many times in the DEIR. It is not from a street. The term private street is rarely used for Westfield Way.

Response to Comment No. 55-61

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-51 for a discussion of the project’s voluntary consistency with the primary urban planning goals of the Proposed Draft Specific Plan. Also refer to Response to Comment No. 18-55 for a discussion of the anchor retailer’s pedestrian accessibility.

Comment No. 55-62

Table IV.E-3

Page 517, Bullet One *“The ground level retail uses oriented along Victory Boulevard would include ground level entrances that would be accessible ...from the new internal roadway.”*

Comment: Another distortion of the intent of a guideline. Buildings are supposed to front on the street with fenestration. The entrance is supposed to be facing the public street. This is an attempt to create a technicality that should not be allowed, as it is contrary to the intent of the guideline. Bullets two, three and four on page 522 state the roadway is a driveway and not a street, either public or private. There are not sidewalks with parkways on both sides of any “driveway.” The project’s anchor retail is not consistent at all with walkability.

Response to Comment No. 55-62

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-51 for a discussion of the project’s voluntary consistency with the primary urban planning goals of the Proposed Draft Specific Plan.

Comment No. 55-63

Page 521, Bullet One *“In non-residential uses, most (ie. [sic] 75%) of the ground floor building Façade should be devoted to pedestrian entrances, pedestrian-level displays windows and/or pedestrian level windows affording views into and out of the building interior..”*

Comment: The DEIR gives this as Partially [sic] consistent, but it is significant that the largest building of the project with a wall over 400’ long on Victory Boulevard totally violates

this requirement. This requirement could be met if the project utilized the differences in elevation between Victory Boulevard at 808' and the interior level of 822'-825'. This would allow a ground level floor of retail uses along Victory Boulevard at 808" elevation that is under the Retail anchor with an entrance at 825' elevation. This also offers the option of one level of underground parking or underground robotic valet parking.

Response to Comment No. 55-63

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-53 for a discussion of this provision.

Comment No. 55-64

Page 522, Bullet Two *"The project's parking facilities would be accessible via internal driveways."*

Comment: Once again, the DEIR states that internal circulation and access are provided by use of driveways – not standard streets, or alleys, public or private.

Page 522, Bullet Three *"Vehicular access to and from the parking areas would be provided via driveways...."*

Comment: Once again, the DEIR states that internal circulation and access are provided by use of driveways – not standard streets, or alleys, public or private.

Page 522, Bullet Four *"The proposed driveway widths would meet and would not exceed the standard width"*

Comment: Once again, the DEIR states that internal circulation and access are provided by use of driveways – not standard streets, or alleys, public or private.

Response to Comment No. 55-64

The Draft EIR uses both "internal roadways" and "driveways" to describe the internal drives that would intersect the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-65

Page 524, Bullet One *"Therefore, project would be compatible."*

Comment: Maybe it is between Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue, but not between Erwin Street and Victory. The Applicant does little to connect to its project to the south, the Westfield Promenade. There is connectivity apparently at the “driveway” of CostPlus on and adjacent property to the 30-foot roadway. This roadway should be a street with sidewalks on both sides to meet the mid-block passageway criteria. Otherwise there is little safe passage mid-block. Where the roadway exits on Erwin is far from being mid-block.

Response to Comment No. 55-65

The Applicant does not own the property that contains the Cost Plus building referenced by the Commentor. The nearest point of connection to the Westfield Promenade is at the corners of Erwin Street and Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Erwin Street and Owensmouth Avenue. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-66

Page 524, Bullet Two *“Where incorporated, mid-block passageways or paseos should be active, visually interesting, and safe places.”*

Comment: The pedestrian-oriented spaces at the core of the retail shopping center meet this requirement but its [sic] really stretching the truth that the landscaped walkways have active uses along them. Surface parking and parking structures are not the active uses intended. The “landscaping” for the walkways through the anchor retail tenant surface parking consists solely of trees required per parking spaces. There are no active node, water features, rest places, etc. This is another instance of false advertising.

The parking structure should have active uses lining the ground floor, but that won’t be done because the Applicant could be putting the structure on a separate lot so that it can be sold if necessary.

Response to Comment No. 55-66

The retail and parking structure are now proposed to engage one another, thus creating activity at the base of the garage. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the project’s pedestrian oriented open space.

Comment No. 55-67

Page 524, Bullet Three *“Additional trees would also be planted within the surface parking areas and along new pedestrian paths that would traverse the project site.”*

Comment: This is about the furniture zone that needs to be landscaped. There are no furniture zones along these pedestrian paths traversing the surface parking because there are “driveways” not streets there which would have sidewalks protected by a furniture/landscape zone. The applicant is once again implying something that doesn’t exist. I am getting tired of the pervasiveness of these distortions.

Response to Comment No. 55-67

Within the Walkability Checklist, the landscape/furniture zone plus curb is defined as the area between the curb face and the front edge of the walkway. As shown in the Conceptual Landscaping Plan provided in Figure II-18 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project would include shade-producing street trees that would be planted close to one another within the landscape/furniture zone. Thus, as set forth in the Draft EIR, the project would be consistent with the Walkability Checklist principle referenced by the Commentor.

Comment No. 55-68**IV.H Traffic, Access, and Parking****2. Environmental Setting****a. Existing Conditions****(2) Freeway System**

Page 711, Second Paragraph *“Interchanges are provided at Ventura Boulevard, Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Canoga Avenue and De Soto Avenue in the study area.”*

Comment: Canoga Ave is a half interchange with no northbound on-ramp and no southbound off-ramp. This error is also in the GTC Traffic Study report.

Response to Comment No. 55-68

The reference to an interchange is meant to denote a location with access to and from the freeway. As the Canoga Avenue Interchange provides limited freeway access, it is considered an interchange for the purposes of this analysis.

Comment No. 55-69**(3) Transit**

Page 715, First Paragraph *“The Warner Center Transit Hub is an on-street transfer center located approximately on [sic] block from the project site.”*

Comment: The sentence as is a misleading understatement as written. The most accurate description should give the actual distance in feet. This error is also in the GTC Traffic Study report. It would be more correct if it were to read “...located approximately one superblock (x feet, y minute average walk) from the project site.”

To give a true perspective of the distances involved it should be noted that from the center of the transit hub it is about a third of a mile to the proposed hotel and almost half a mile walk to the “courtyard” of the member-only anchor retailer.

Response to Comment No. 55-69

The two closest project access points to the Warner Center Transit Hub— the West Valley Way entrance and the Erwin Street entrance—are approximately a 0.25 mile walk, which is the generally accepted walking distance between a destination and a transit stop.

Comment No. 55-70**(a) Metro Bus Rapid Transit and Rapid Service**

Page 715, First Paragraph *“...adjacent to the Promenade, less than one block from the project site...”*

Comment: Likewise, the sentence as is again misleading as written. The more accurate description would be to give the actual distance in feet. This error is also in the GTC Traffic Study report. It should read “...less than one superblock (x feet, y minute average walk) from the project site...”

Response to Comment No. 55-70

The two closest project access points, West Valley Way entrance or Erwin Street entrance, to the Warner Center Transit Hub are approximately a 0.25 mile walking distance, which is the generally accepted walking distance between a destination and a transit stop.

Comment No. 55-71

Page 716, First Line *“...to board and alight from the Orange Line less than a block from the project site...”*

Comment: Likewise, the sentence repeat the misleading statement that should read *“...less than one superblock (x feet, y minute average walk) from the project site...”*

Response to Comment No. 55-71

The two closest project access points, West Valley Way entrance or Erwin Street entrance, to the Warner Center Transit Hub are approximately a 0.25 mile walking distance, which is the generally accepted walking distance between a destination and a transit stop.

Comment No. 55-72**3. Environmental Impacts****a. Methodology****(2) Operational Traffic - Intersections****Page 742**

Comment: The studies performed and the analysis is not mode neutral, as only automobile traffic impacts seems to be of concern. There is no discussion in regards to the LOS for pedestrians and cyclists at the intersections. There is also no mention of mitigating any secondary negative impacts to the LOS for pedestrians and cyclists from loss of lanes, additional width to creos, [sic] elimination of potential bike lanes or narrowing of sidewalks. Secondary impacts should be mitigated by requiring purchase of additional right of way and fees for improving the safety for all modes of travel.

Response to Comment No. 55-72

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-9.

Comment No. 55-73**(4) Public Transit Analysis**

Page 749, Last Paragraph *“The 15% transit mode share applied to this analysis is higher than the transit mode shares recommended by CMP guidelines (the CMP estimates approximately 7% transit usage for similar commercial developments)...a transit credit per LADOT Policies and Procedures was applied due to the project’s proximity to the Warner Center Transit Hub and a TDM credit was applied per the Warner Center Specific Plan”*

Comment: The credit for transit mode share should receive more scrutiny or it should be better detailed for credibility purposes. Although the transit hub may be close enough to the project by direct distance measurement, in reality, there is no direct access between the project and the transit hub. The increased walking distance to circumnavigate the properties in between would deter some pedestrians. Context is important and there is no information given to assure decision makers that similar commercial developments are being compared in the same context.

Response to Comment No. 55-73

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-11.

Comment No. 55-74**(6) Site Access****Page 750**

Comment: The methodology seems to be related only to expected passing-by traffic. Where is the refinement that allocates traffic to driveways by use and trip destination frequencies? Site entries for office-related destinations would be expected to be different from fueling which would be different from retail because these uses are not equally distributed across the site. Using models with averages has the potential to hide significant impacts.

Response to Comment No. 55-74

The traffic study takes into account both traffic that is external to the project site and project generated traffic. The traffic study describes the methodology used to develop the traffic volumes at the analyzed driveways. Therefore, the analysis examines the effect of project traffic and external street traffic. Figures 17 and 18 of the Traffic Study's LADOT Memorandum of Understanding (Draft EIR Appendix H-2) illustrate the assignment of project traffic at the individual driveways. These assumptions were reviewed and approved by LADOT.

Comment No. 55-75**(7) Parking*****Page 751***

Comment: Apparently, according to the statement, only aggregate demand was analyzed. There is no analysis regarding the type of parking, the location and the distribution of parking. The assumption is that all parking is equal in satisfying the demands of the drivers, which is very unlikely. On a project of this size, the use of a shared parking analysis may not be completely valid without further assessment of the parking configuration and distances between uses and the parking. Psychological aspects of drivers can be important and must be addressed. No mention is made of taking into account these factors. Using averages for models can ignore factors that are significant. Additionally, no analysis has been done yet for the proposal of parking control gates. Doing this after the site is built and finished is foolish, when other site plan alternatives may be easier to mitigate problems associated with parking control gates or they may not be needed at all.

Response to Comment No. 55-75

Shared parking takes into account the peak parking demand patterns of the land uses onsite. Each land use has a distinct demand pattern and the concept of shared parking maximizes the relationships of these demand patterns. Traffic Study Table 16B (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) provides detail of the individual land uses that comprise the peak day of the peak month parking demand for the project. The highest hour of demand represents the peak parking demand of the project. The entire parking supply is intended to be shared among all users, therefore the parking configuration is designed such that users are able to conveniently access their destination. This design feature combined with the appropriate wayfinding signage will allow users to park wherever they are comfortable on the site. Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of the project's potential controlled parking program.

Comment No. 55-76**(8) Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety*****Page 751***

Comment: No discussion is made to verify that an appropriate methodology was used nor why there are no significant areas concerned. This is totally inadequate. It appears that the authors and DOT find this aspect too bothersome or trivial to make an effort to explore these impacts. AS a matter of LOS, a truthful study would also include methodology that determines if the facilities and layout deter pedestrians and cyclists from using them. For instance, will routing pedestrians and cyclists across many parking bays through the middle of the member-only surface parking area deter pedestrians and cyclists from using that pathway? Were any user surveys taken or studies reviewed to justify this route as adequate? Has this been glossed over because it is a token pathway to make the project look good on paper?

Response to Comment No. 55-76

Section IV.H, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, includes an analysis of pedestrian/bicycle safety at the project site, describes the methodology used to analyze pedestrian/bicycle safety, and establishes a significance threshold against which to analyze this impact. This analysis includes determining whether the project will result in a regular increase in pedestrian/vehicle or bicycle/vehicle conflict due to project parking and traffic as compared to existing conditions. The Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) was prepared to LADOT's standards. All findings of the study have been reviewed and approved by LADOT. The City of Los Angeles does not have standards in place to determine pedestrian or bicycle level of service (LOS). Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for a discussion of the project's pedestrian and bicycle access.

The site plan does include an exclusive pedestrian path through the surface parking lot in front of the member-only anchor retailer so pedestrians and bicyclists will not be required to walk/ride through the active parking aisles of the surface lot. The external street multi-use path is connected to the pedestrian areas of the project by sidewalks and crosswalks at every entrance location.

Comment No. 55-77**b. Thresholds of Significance****(8) Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety*****Page 751***

Comment: The problem with the approach of predicting increases in pedestrian/vehicle or bicycle/vehicle conflict is that poor facilities are self mitigating. Dangerous or uncomfortable paths and intersections will deter pedestrians and cyclists from using those pathways. Numbers alone cannot be used to justify lack of significant impact. Any assessment should include discussion of the favorability of the pathway and the context for presence of pedestrians. Some routes will be favored more than others. The City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide seems to be biased in favor of automobile traffic considerations because environmental context is less of an issue, allowing for reliance on numbers instead of reasoning.

Response to Comment No. 55-77

The Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) was prepared to LADOT's standards. All findings of the study have been reviewed and approved by LADOT. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 55-78**c. Product Design Feature****d. Analysis of Project Impacts****(2) Operation****(a) Intersections*****Page 782***

Comment: There is no analysis regarding level of service degradation for pedestrians or cyclists. The analysis is not mode-neutral as it deals only with automotive traffic.

(e) Access**Page 798**

Comment: There is no analysis regarding access for pedestrians or cyclists

Response to Comment No. 55-78

The Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) was prepared to LADOT's standards. All findings of the study have been reviewed and approved by LADOT. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 55-79***(iii) Analysis of Internal Circulation*****Page 798 to 799**

Comment: There is no analysis regarding internal circulation for anything in the project other than the gas station that could back up onto the streets. The analysis that is there only covers queue capacity. There does not appear to be any mention of circulation problems occurring at entry and exit points and traffic crossover during peak demand at or above the 90th percentile. Is it reasonable to believe that a sole attendant can monitor full queuing and peak pump operations at the same time?

While DOT may not have concerns regarding internal circulation of any modes, planning should assess the performance of the internal circulation in regards to land uses, uses distribution, and the effects of the planned circulation or lack thereof on the future development of the community.

Project circulation that is fixed for the long term by construction of structures such as the hotel, office tower(s) and parking structure that serve as long-term obstructions to the development of the local community should not be allowed. There is no analysis showing that there are no long-term impacts on the internal and local external circulations needs. While this may not be technically a requirement of CEQA, it is a necessary consideration to protect the public's interests in the future.

Response to Comment No. 55-79

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding the fuel station's queuing. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

The traffic analysis for the project includes the driveways and access points for land parcels adjacent to the project and across the street from the project. Traffic to these adjacent and nearby projects was included in the analysis of project access points and analysis of intersections serving all of the land uses in the area. The site access analysis presented in the Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) indicates that all driveways are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better upon completion of the project.

Comment No. 55-80**(A) Queue Analysis*****Page 799***

Comment: The analysis provided is not adequate. While it does provide the probable number of queue spaces necessary to accommodate the 90th percentile, and Figure 56 – Fueling Station Queue Analysis on page 370 of the Traffic Study in Appendix H-3 shows that there is physical space to accommodate 62 cars, there is no analysis of the probability of cars queuing perfectly to fit in the manner provided.

It appears there was no allowance for or modeling of driver behavior such as when drivers do not know which queue to get in and then changing lanes/backing up (queue jumping). What are the behavioral/safety factors for this many cars in a queue.

The analysis assumes that cars have equal probability of left and right fuel ports, which is not shown to be valid. The analysis would also appear to believe that all cars at the pumps take the same time to take on fuel. In the DEIR there are conflicting graphics regarding station design regarding queuing and fuel tank location. As fuel deliveries are to occur during hours of operation, no mention is made of possible impacts to queuing when fuel deliveries are in process. No statement is made as to how much the queuing capacity it reduced when tankers are present. What is to be expected when the 90th percentile is exceeded? Are there going to be impacted intersections internal to the project?

Response to Comment No. 55-80

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding the fuel station's queuing and fuel truck deliveries.

Comment No. 55-81**(e) Parking*****(iii) Shared Parking Demand Analysis***

Page 802, Last Paragraph *"All anchor retailer parking spaces were assumed to be reserved at all times for the anchor retailer customers."*

Comment: What is the rationale for this assumption? Is it because other non-members of the anchor will be prohibited from using the surface parking through controlled parking? This has not been made clear. Or is this assumption meant to be conservative in the analysis?

Response to Comment No. 55-81

This assumption provides a conservative analysis due to the reduced number of parking spaces that would be available to share among the other uses. As discussed in Appendix H-3 of the Draft EIR, the shared parking demand analysis considered each land use within the project separately in order to identify the peak parking demands of each project component (i.e. the discount club warehouse was separated from the retail component). For the purposes of this analysis, several assumptions related to the availability/exclusivity of the parking supply were made for the discount club warehouse and office uses. Specifically, the analysis assumed that some of the surface spaces will be reserved for use by discount club warehouse customers/employees. During the peak demand periods where the total demand of the discount club warehouse exceeds its reserved supply, any additional demand would be satisfied by the overall parking supply. The office parking supply was assumed to be reserved for office users during weekdays and available for sharing with project visitors and employees during weekend hours. Because these spaces were reserved for particular user groups, the office and discount club warehouse parking supply/demand patterns were tracked separately but included in the shared parking analysis in order to monitor the overall parking demand on the site.

Comment No. 55-82**(C) Controlled Parking****Page 805**

Comment: Apparently there are concerns for impacts from having open free parking, that would necessitate controlled parking. This is not made adequately clear. One can guess that convenient parking is inadequate due to concentration of the bulk of parking at the center of the site in Phase 2. The proposed member-only anchor has stated in public meetings that it must have a certain amount of surface parking for the convenience of its members.

There is a minor portion of surface parking along Topanga Canyon and Victory Boulevards, which will be presumably in high demand due to the convenience offered. The prevention of employees parking in these areas plus their nature of being Premium Spots would necessitate parking meters. If not, people will seek these spots regardless of the minimal fee or validated free parking offered in the structure. It comes down to convenience in the form of time it takes to get to the spaces or into the parking structure and the proximity of the parking to their destination. Multiple dispersed parking structures might serve the purposes of controlled parking in a better manner. This would also serve to disperse the internal traffic pattern instead of concentrating it along two major driveways through the project from Victory and Topanga Canyon Boulevards.

A potential issue of concern is that if there is not segregated parking for the member-only anchor customers, then should the member-only anchor demand more surface parking, the applicant may choose to demolish the existing office building to create additional surface parking, which would impact the residents across Owensmouth.

John Alderson, a representative of Westfield LLC, has in public meetings with the PLUM Committee of the Woodland Hills-Warner Center Neighborhood Council, made mention that there would be valet service on the Topanga Canyon Boulevard side of the project to offer convenience for customers. Given the labor costs and concerns for damage by conventional valets, serious consideration should be given to using multiple smaller parking structures utilizing automated robotic parking. They offer better convenience, possibly quicker delivery than traditional valet, better integration into retail structures, consume half of the space, and better security than a conventional structure with reduced maintenance and energy costs.

Response to Comment No. 55-82

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for discussion of the project's potential controlled parking plan. See also Response to Comment No. 18-21.

Comment No. 55-83**(e) Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety**

Page 805 to 806 "The Village would result in the development of a cohesive, pedestrian oriented [sic] development with a mix of compatible uses and pedestrian amenities. The projects landscaping plan would not only 'green' the project site but the adjacent streetscapes as well to encourage pedestrian activity...the project would generally comply with the principles of the City of Los Angeles' Walkability Checklist, which includes the safe design of pedestrian crossings...the project would not result in an increase in pedestrian/vehicle or bicycle/vehicle conflict..."

Comment: These claims overstate the truth. The project as presented is not consistently cohesive as stated. The member-only anchor minimally connects to the rest of the site and does not connect to the rest of the community having created a non-active side facing out to the community. The massive parking structure separates the project into two sites and the potentiall [sic] exclusive surface parking for the member-only anchor reinforces this. The majority of the length of what is pedestrian and cyclists [sic] pathways are not pedestrian-oriented spaces with active uses facing them.

Claims of walkability checklist compliance stretches credibility and they have not been shown. For example, referencing critical aspects of the checklist:

Are the buildings orientated to the street and connecting to the (Public) sidewalk and Street? No, many connect to internal driveways and parking structures.

Are the primary entrances for pedestrians ... easily accessible from transit stops, with as direct a path as possible to the transit stop? Not for any stops on Owensmouth Avenue.

Does the retail establishment maintain at least one entrance from the public way with doors unlocked during regular business hours? No, the member-only project only connects to a driveway.

Especially on long blocks, are passageways or paseos incorporated into midblock developments, which facilitate pedestrian movement through the

depth of the block to the front of the next parallel block, such that pedestrians need not walk the circumference of a block in order to access the middle of the next parallel block or alley or parking behind the block? No or very poorly. Passageways and paseos suggest enclosure and are not equivalent to pathways through surface parking and parking structures. There is no defined, safe, north-south passage through the middle of the block.

Response to Comment No. 55-83

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project site's pedestrian connections. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 55-84

Are the mid-block passageways or paseos active, visually interesting spaces, and safe? No. They are out in the open except for the center pedestrian oriented spaces between the retail and office uses.

Are they active with building entrances, windows, seating, dining, water features, kiosks, vending or displays, or public art? Very limited to none. The parking structure has no active uses on the ground floor around the perimeter of the building.

Do the building frontages create a sense of enclosure and a sense of an outdoor room? For the bulk of the project, no they do not. The member-only surface parking is a large outdoor room for cars and not people.

Do they enhance pedestrian comfort by providing views into buildings and beyond the street wall? They only do so on Topanga Canyon Blvd. and possibly Erwin St.

Do they create a sense of human scale or enhance pedestrian comfort and safety by providing facades that are "eyes on the street" through windows looking out to the street? They only do so only on Topanga and Erwin.

As these buildings are mostly non-residential, are most (i.e. [sic] 75%) of the ground floor building façade devoted to pedestrian entrances, pedestrian-level windows affording views into and out to the building interior? They are only so in the western portion of the project facing Topanga Canyon Boulevard and the interior pedestrian-oriented space. According to Mr. John Alderson of Westfield, frontages facing the parking structure are not likely to have active façades with windows.

Are the spaces created by set backs, [sic] building cut-offs and or breaks in exterior walls turned into active spaces, such as active plazas or courtyards (activities such as dining; seating; water features; kiosks; vending or displays? There are none created on the perimeter, with the possible exception of parts of Topanga and Erwin.

Does the Building Frontage contribute to PlaceMaking? Not with a passive, low, yet very long wall on Victory that is not matched anywhere in the community much less represent the character of building typology in the community.

Just the fact that someone could walk on a path does not fits the definition as walkable for purposes of urban design and supporting the vitality required for PlaceMaking. The applicant would never consider creating its mall interiors in the same manner as it treats its pedestrians away from the pedestrian-oriented spaces.

Response to Comment No. 55-84

The project is substantially consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-47 through 54 for more information regarding the project's consistency with the City's Walkability Checklist. Please also refer to the consistency analysis included in Table IV.E-4 in Section IV.E, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the project's pedestrian orientation, the parking structure and additional information regarding each of these comments.

Comment No. 55-85

There are numerous instances where the intended pedestrian pathways cross traffic at uncontrolled intersections of driveways and lead pedestrians through a busy surface parking lot. Pedestrians coming from the bus stop by the gas station have to cross three lanes of traffic twice on their way to the entrance of the member-only anchor. There are no pedestrian sidewalks along the east perimeter of the parking structure to accommodate pedestrian from adjacent properties.

Response to Comment No. 55-85

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project site's pedestrian connections. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 55-86

(i) Consistency with Plans

(ii) Operation

Page 808, Second Paragraph

Comment: Since the member-only anchor building is served by the parking structure, it may not be designed per the Specific Plan requirements in section 10.B.2 “*to be compatible in color, material, and architectural detail with the building it serves...*”, i.e. [sic] with façade of the member-only anchor.

Response to Comment No. 55-86

The central parking structure will be compatible with the overall contemporary architectural design aesthetic of the project. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 and Response to Comment No. 55-14 for additional information regarding the design of the project’s parking structure.

Comment No. 55-87

Page 809, Table IV.H-13, Policy 11-1.1

Comment: The proposed plan can only be partially consistent when, even though it supposedly will create a TDM plan, it does not adequately provide suitable inviting facilities that encourage the use of bicycles and walking on the eastern majority of the property through meaningful access ways.

Response to Comment No. 55-87

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for a discussion of the project site’s numerous trails, sidewalks, and internal passageways which can be used by bicyclists and pedestrians.

Comment No. 55-88

Page 809, Table IV.H-13, Policy 13-1.1

Comment: Sidewalks are considered part of streets and highways under the California Vehicle Code. There is no evidence that traffic impacts on sidewalks or impacts on motorized bicycles were addressed.

Response to Comment No. 55-88

Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts. The Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) was prepared to LADOT's standards. All findings of the study have been reviewed and approved by LADOT.

Comment No. 55-89

Page 809, Table IV.H-13, Policy 13-2.1

Error: The table has this labeled as 13-1.1

Response to Comment No. 55-89

The Commentor is correct, Table IV.H-13 incorrectly referred to the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan Policy 13-1.1. This table has been revised to refer to the appropriate policy, which is 13-2.1. Please refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR.

Comment No. 55-90

Comment: As facilities for pedestrians and cyclists were not considered at these intersections, it cannot be claimed that all of the significant degradation in levels of service are being mitigated. Levels of service for cyclists and pedestrians were not addressed so there is no consistency.

Response to Comment No. 55-90

The Traffic Study (Draft EIR Appendix H-3) was prepared to LADOT's standards. All findings of the study have been reviewed and approved by LADOT. Please refer to Topical Response No. 3 for additional information regarding the project's measures to avoid pedestrian conflicts.

Comment No. 55-91

Page 810, Table IV.H-13, Policy 15-1.3

Comment: Since the member-only anchor building is served by the parking structure, it may not be designed per the Specific Plan requirements in section 10.B.2 “to be compatible in color, material, and architectural detail with the building it serves...”, i.e. [sic] with façade of the member-only anchor. So, by extension of intent, as far as architectural details go, at a minimum, due to the eventual length of the parking structure being grater [sic] than 800’, the parking structure should have the same requirements as the member-only anchor structure for variation of the faces by at least 15 feet in a birds-eye view plan for at least 15% of the length of the building. The project plan is not yet consistent with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Response to Comment No. 55-91

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-14 for a discussion of the parking structure’s design.

Comment No. 55-92

5. Mitigation Measures

b. Operation

Intersections – Physical Improvements

(2) Phase 2

Page 814, Mitigation Measure H-24 “An additional southbound through lane would be added through the intersection requiring the removal of the west side sidewalk underneath the US-101 overpass.”

Comment: It should be noted that this has already been done as of April 2011.

Response to Comment No. 55-92

In addition to the additional southbound through lane, the complete improvement includes the reconfiguration of the Canoga Avenue and US-101 Westbound Off-ramp to provide a free-flow right-turn from the off-ramp onto northbound Canoga Avenue. In the event that this mitigation measure or an alternative mitigation measure is no longer feasible, the project shall provide funds to the Warner Center Trust Fund, as specified in LADOT’s approval letter included in the Draft EIR as Appendix H-1, for implementation of a future improvement. The Draft EIR conservatively concluded that impacts would be

significant and unavoidable, in the event that not all of the proposed mitigation is approved or becomes infeasible.

Comment No. 55-93

6. Level of Significance After Mitigation

b. Operation

(2) Neighborhood Intrusion

Page 823, Top Paragraph

Comment: The Neighborhood Traffic Management program within DOT is currently disbanded or not staffed. An alternative provision needs to be included to preserve the mitigation measure when this program is not functioning.

Response to Comment No. 55-93

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a detailed discussion of the project's potential neighborhood impacts and neighborhood protection program.

Comment No. 55-94

V. Alternatives

2. Alternatives Considered and Rejected

Page 910, Mitigation First Bullet – Alternative Site, Paragraph 2 “...(e.g., a mixed-use project located in a suburban Regional Center area in close proximity to transit services and other service destinations)...”

Comment: Suburban mischaracterizes the context. Warner Center does not fit a definition of suburban. If it were not for the fact that it is part of Los Angeles, it would be the urban downtown core of the area. This should read as an urban regional center. Use of Suburban is used to justify a suburban model for the project. Suburban is typically used to represent areas that are predominantly residential. That may fit the areas surrounding Warner Center, but it does not fit Warner Center with multiple high-rises.

Response to Comment No. 55-94

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 55-19.

Comment No. 55-95

Page 912, Mitigation First Bullet – Alternatives to Eliminate Significant Air Quality Impacts *“In addition, it is important to note that due to the appreciable internal trip capture between the various uses comprising the project, traffic generation to and from the project site would be less than the sum of the trips from an array of smaller properties hosting the same amount of development.”*

Comment: There is no substantiation offered that this statement is true. It’s a very broad assumption to make that there are never any instances where other options of the same density would yield fewer trips. There is also no analysis that this project is the optimal mix of mixed uses. Where is the analysis showing that a residential component would increase trips instead of reduce them.[sic]

Response to Comment No. 55-95

Trip estimates provided in the Draft EIR were derived from *Trip Generation, 8th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2008). The ITE retail trip-generation equation does not result in a linear increase in trips; instead, trips increase in an exponential manner. As a project increases in size, the equivalent trip-generation rate decreases due to the exponential nature of the equation. In other words, applying the trip-generation equation to a single project would result in fewer trips generated than a group of smaller projects (with the same amount of development). The Draft EIR quotation referenced by the Commentor does not claim that “...there are never any instances where other options of the same density would yield fewer trips,” “...this project is the optimal mix of mixed uses,” or “...a residential component would increase trips instead of reduce them.”

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-96

Page 912, Mitigation Second Bullet – Alternative Without Proposed Anchor Retailer *“Anchor retail stores, which can be department stores or a major retail chain, are used to provide the primary draw for people to visit a shopping center. People often combine this visit with visiting other smaller retail shops, dining at adjacent restaurants, or watching a movie. These anchors not only drive interest, but they create significant jobs and sales tax revenues much needed by the city... The project applicant designed the project to provide*

an anchor retailer, which would complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center and support smaller lifestyle retailers, a hotel and other mixed-uses.”

Comment: While the statement could be true in many instances, it is not necessarily valid in this instance. In the context of where there are no other significant retailers around, such as greenfield [sic] construction, an anchor is needed. In the case here, the context is much different. The Applicant states soon afterward that there are already many anchor stores in the vicinity. Those existing anchors are attracting people past this site. Therefore, the importance of an anchor to draw shoppers to this highly trafficked area to the degree claimed is questionable. This site needs to be evaluated in the context of the site as is in between two destinations that the Applicant also owns. What is more significant is that the proposed Anchor, Costco, wants to be at this location because of the existing Anchors in the surrounding area draw customers to Costco.

Response to Comment No. 55-96

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion of the importance of providing an anchor retailer at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-97

As far as being a complementary use, the proposed anchor tenant is not necessarily a use for which trips can be combined easily with the other uses. Shoppers at a Costco are encouraged to buy large quantities of products, predisposing them to use of automobiles. A majority of these customers purchase perishable items, which require them to leave the premises upon completion of their Costco purchases. From personal experience, I can say that shopping at Costco consumes at least an hour if not more. Is it to be expected that people will spend hours in a movie or hanging out at the lifestyle/retail stores and then head over to Costco for a multi-hour shopping experience? Intuition says it's not likely for many of them.

Costco is a poor example for needing an Anchor tenant in the context of this site. Anchor tenants at adjacent properties are more likely to draw people to this project than Costco. A residential component would likely have a stronger complementary relationship than Costco. More emphasis on PlaceMaking with an active Mainstreet ambience, outdoor activities and entertainment would draw more customers to the other retail parts of the site than a Costco as such a special place does not currently exist in Woodland Hills. There are no studies presented for cases in a similar context that show Costco can act as a bonafide [sic] role as an anchor. It's pure speculation on the part of the Applicant. One

could probably argue that the member-only anchor diminishes the probability [sic] of success for the project.

Visitors of the hotel are not seeking to buy mass quantities from a Costco and should not be considered as complementary use to a discount warehouse store. Lifestyle retailers can serve the hotel guests and this is considerably much more of a complementary relationship than any of the uses with the Costco. If Costco were closer to the grocery store there might be a complementary relationship there, but when separated as proposed, the perishables become a more important consideration and possibly result in two separate trips.

Response to Comment No. 55-97

An anchor retailer is a critical component of all of the Applicant's developments and is a traditional part of most shopping centers. The Costco anchor retailer would raise the visibility of the project in the community and provide the initial encouragement for people to visit. Individually, the project's smaller shopping center retail shops are unlikely to attract the same number of visitors to the project as a large anchor retailer. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion of the importance of providing an anchor retailer at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-98

The sales tax issue for the Anchor is bogus because it is replacing a current location. There may be some increase in a larger store, but one could also say that some sales are equally lost, as some shoppers would find this site too far to travel.

Response to Comment No. 55-98

The comment does not raise an issue about the adequacy of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. With respect to tax revenues generated by the project, see also the response to Comment No. 41-2.

Comment No. 55-99

Page 913, Third Paragraph *“The [sic] Costco anchor retailer would raise the visibility of the project in the community and provide initial encouragement for people to visit... The project would likely generate less project revenue and sales tax revenue without the anchor retailer and would not provide the same broad range of uses.”*

Comment: The added visibility is of weak importance to the project compared to the viability already added by the surrounding anchors and local retail activity. The area is already a regional retail destination. The influence of a new anchor will add some extra interest although it is not to the degree of critical significance, as the Applicant would have us believe.

Response to Comment No. 55-99

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 27-2 for a discussion of the importance of providing an anchor retailer at the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-100

The statement on less revenue and sales tax is unsubstantiated and purely rhetorical, designed to plant an idea that an anchor is critical when it hasn't been shown to be critical and there has been no evidence presented that a different project without this anchor could not be a stronger attraction. It is possible that another anchor might have less revenues by itself yet it would be more complimentary to the other uses and the sales as a whole would be greater, possibly to the point that revenues would exceed that of having Costco as an anchor tenant, especially since it is only moving the collection of those sales taxes from one part of Canoga Park to the other end of Canoga Park

Response to Comment No. 55-100

The comment does not raise an issue about the adequacy of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-101

The dependence of the Applicant's project on the Costco should be rejected, because pertinent and possibly viable alternatives have not been explored because the applicant has self-limited the options to justify the needs of the member-only anchor, an opportunity that may not be as beneficial to the community compared to the other unexplored options. It is the Applicant's dependence or specialization on mall-type retail that predisposes them to require an anchor tenant.

An assessment done by an urban designer/planner proficient in urban retail, such as Seth Harry of Washington, DC., [sic] should be required to justify that there are no other alternatives.

Response to Comment No. 55-101

The project Applicant designed the project to provide for an anchor retailer, which would complement the existing retail offering in Warner Center and support smaller retailers, a hotel, and other mixed uses. The Applicant did identify one potential anchor in Costco and has entered into an agreement for participation in this project. The Costco anchor retailer would raise the visibility of the project in the community and provide the initial encouragement for people to visit. Individually, the project's smaller shopping center retail shops are unlikely to attract the same number of visitors to the project as a large anchor retailer. The project would also likely generate less project revenue and sales tax revenue without the anchor retailer, and would not provide the same broad range of uses.

Comment No. 55-102

Page 914, Fourth Paragraph *“Removal [sic] of the anchor retailer would not fulfill the underlying purpose of the project to create a distinctive mixed commercial environment within the community.”*

Comment: This exaggerated statement that a warehouse store in a commercial center makes it distinctive and could not be done another way is outright preposterous. It infers that a warehouse store is more beneficial than a performing arts center or does a better job at active placemaking than other choices.

Distinctive only means different, not necessarily better. Urbanistically, using a different building typology for the warehouse store from that proposed would make it distinctive in a good way but not as proposed with a fancy shell pasted on a typology that belongs to a commercial node adjacent to a highway.

Response to Comment No. 55-102

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 15-4 for a discussion of the anchor retail building's proposed distinctive architectural elements. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the design of the project and proposed anchor retailer. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-103

My suggestions for a real alternative

I think the uses proposed could still be done in a manner that is better for the long-term development of the community.

As stated earlier, there is the possibility of lining commercial or residential uses around the anchor retailer by utilizing the sites terrain to have retail on Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue with the Anchor retail on the second floor with its entrance at ground level in the center of the project fronting full private streets that run through the super-block north to south and east to west. There would be the option of having underground parking or underground robotic valet parking that would offer the convenience of bringing the cars to the members of the anchor retailer when they are departing. The fueling station could be located in a large island in a one way circular street connecting to the private streets going east, south, west and north. If the fuel station were recessed it could also be accessible by a tunnel from the underground parking garage.

I am appending to my comments simple illustrations of the concepts. The aerial view shows how the member-only anchor could be accommodated at the site with much better urbanism. Admittedly the amount of development is much more than proposed, but this is done to show the potential of the site over the long-term.

The member-only anchor is shown in sky blue and the fuel station would be at the green jelly bean area in the center. That site could be used for a park, parking structure or other use when the fuel station is no longer needed. The concept has most of the parking in robotic valet structures above active uses. There is much more useful open space that is pedestrian oriented.

Response to Comment No. 55-103

Due to the relatively high water table in the area, underground parking and a below-grade fuel station would require extensive dewatering. Robotic parking systems do not operate at the speed necessary to accommodate the rate of turnover required for customers. The sections proposed also suggest the construction of a podium elevated roughly 17 feet above the adjacent streets, which will serve to isolate this area visually and make the streets surrounding the property less pedestrian-friendly. Alternative site plans with the anchor retailer located internal to the site were evaluated as part of Alternative F – Modified Site Plans, in the Draft EIR.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 55-104

H-3 Traffic Study

Page 40 of pdf (page 25 of GTC report)

Error: Intersection 24 is incorrectly listed as an Eastbound off-ramp which does not exist. Five pages later, on Figure 4C, it is given as a Westbound off-ramp which does exist.

Response to Comment No. 55-104

This is a typographical error; however, the referenced intersection index number is correct. The text listing is correct in that it indicates the existing intersection Level of Service at the Canoga Avenue Interchange was adjusted to reflect field observations. Please refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, for the revision to this statement.

Comment Letter No. 56

Julie R. Szende
6501 Penfield Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
jxszende@yahoo.com

Comment No. 56-1

I have read the proposals in the EIR Draft for The Village at Westfield Topanga. I think that important things have been omitted. The way I see it, there are key problems in the Draft EIR that have not been brought to light. These problems will cause many hardships for the people living in the area of the proposed Costco in the West SF Valley.

Westfield's proposals leave lots of questions unanswered. I think a revised EIR is needed that goes over these questions thoroughly. The current EIR doesn't really solve my concerns, and I don't think it has analyzed my two vital concerns below:

Response to Comment No. 56-1

The Draft EIR is comprehensive and has been prepared in accordance with CEQA requirements. Potential impacts have been fully disclosed and are based on the significance thresholds and methodologies set forth within the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide. In addition, where feasible, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the environmental impacts of the proposed project. As demonstrated by the response to comments in this Final EIR, there are no new significant impacts associated with the project that have not already been identified as part of the Draft EIR. Thus, recirculation of a revised EIR is not required. The specific comments made by the Commentor are individually responded to below.

Comment No. 56-2

#1. The 20+pump gas station at the corner of Victory and Owensmouth. There are many problems with the placement of a large gas station at this corner. Traffic congestion and danger of collision with tanker trucks delivering gas are two of them. But by far the most important is the contamination of the groundwater under the gas station. Costco will be constructed above the underground waterway that delivers runoff and groundwater to the headwaters of the Los Angeles River. This is a Nature Conservancy Project. The Conservancy has made a thorough study of ways to keep groundwater and runoff pure so it will not contaminate area neighborhoods or the Pacific Ocean. Gasoline

seeping into this groundwater would ruin all the work of the Conservancy. As a longtime member of the Sierra Club, I protest this disregard of the environment.

Response to Comment No. 56-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a discussion of the fuel station's safety features.

Comment No. 56-3

But by far the most important is the contamination of the groundwater under the gas station. Costco will be constructed above the underground waterway that delivers runoff and groundwater to the headwaters of the Los Angeles River. This is a Nature Conservancy Project. The Conservancy has made a thorough study of ways to keep groundwater and runoff pure so it will not contaminate area neighborhoods or the Pacific Ocean. Gasoline seeping into this groundwater would ruin all the work of the Conservancy. As a longtime member of the Sierra Club, I protest this disregard of the environment.

Response to Comment No. 56-3

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding the safety measures associated with the fueling station, the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the fueling station, and regulations pertaining to any dewatering needed at the site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 56-4

#2. **No buffer area around the Costco store.** The way the Costco facility is currently designed, the buffer area around it isn't large enough. All Costco stores have debris surrounding them (by debris I mean garbage and trash, piles of used tires, stacked loads of cardboard, stored wood pallets, and stored shopping carts). This debris is usually contained by buffer areas around the stores. But in The Village Costco, there is not enough space allotted for a buffer zone. This means safety problems for drivers, and shoppers walking in the parking lots. Health hazards are a possibility, too, because of rats and other vermin who might be attracted by the overflow of garbage.

Response to Comment No. 56-4

The area immediately east of the anchor tenant allows for the proper disposal of refuse, loading of merchandise and safe vehicular passage. This area would be screened from view with articulated walls that complement the architecture of the anchor retail building. Refuse from the anchor retailer would be collected and kept within the air conditioned anchor retailer building. The refuse would be picked up as necessary several times per week. Additionally, all tenants must adhere to federal, state, and local sanitary requirements that protect personal safety and minimize vermin intrusions.

Comment No. 56-5

Health hazards are a possibility, too, because of rats and other vermin who might be attracted by the overflow of garbage.

Response to Comment No. 56-5

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 44-3 for a discussion of issues related to refuse.

Comment No. 56-6

I have listed only two of my major concerns over the proposed building of a Costco facility on the corner of Victory and Owensmouth in Woodland Hills. I have many more, but there is not space to list them. My first recommendation is that the facility not be built on the site. Its impact on the people living in the area, on the small businesses in the area, and on the natural environment of the area will be negative and harmful in the extreme. My second recommendation is that the gas station not be installed on the site. I would appreciate it if my concerns above be carefully studied and addressed.

Response to Comment No. 56-6

A project alternative without an anchor retailer was considered in Section V, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, but was rejected as it did not fulfill the project's objectives. Please refer to Response to Comment 27-2 for more information regarding the importance of an anchor retailer at the project site. The Draft EIR also analyzed the potential for urban decay associated with the anchor retailer, and determined that impacts would be less than significant. As discussed in Response to Comment No. 21-3, the proposed gas station is a critical portion of Costco's business model for the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 57

John M. Walker,
a concerned individual and
Vice President of the
Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization (17)
Law Offices of John M. Walker
5850 Canoga Ave., 4th Fl.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 57-1

The following are intended as my comments on the proposed project both as a thirty (30) year resident of the affected community and as Vice President of the Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization (17).

1. DUE PROCESS:

I note that the Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) is some nine (9) volumes and spans the range of some 6,000 pages. This is overwhelming and a daunting task for any member of the general public to undertake in the short prescribed time. Extensions of 45 days were requested by more than one organizations [sic] of citizens but those requests were denied and only the statutory 15 day extension was permitted. This is insufficient time for the public to properly respond to the volume of information provided by professionals in the DEIR. Most of the information provided would require the advanced skills and training of an expert to decipher and respond especially in the areas of traffic studies, geological examination, and the urban blight issues.

The California State Legislature has noted that the planing [sic] process is of utmost interest to the entire community.

California Government Code, Section 65033 provides as follows:

“The Legislature recognizes the importance of public participation at every level of the planning process. It is therefore the policy of the state and the intent of the Legislature that each state, regional, and local agency concerned in the planning process involve the public through public hearings, informative meetings, publicity and other means available to them, and that at such hearings and other public forums, the public be afforded the opportunity to respond to clearly defined alternative objectives, policies, and actions.” (Emphasis added).

It is the policy of this state that land use decisions be made with full knowledge of their economic and fiscal implications to the community and consideration must be given to the long-term environmental impact as well as long-term costs and benefits to the community. (See *Gov't Code* 65030.2.)

The land in our community is an exhaustible resource, not just a commodity, and is essential to the economy, environment and general well-being of the people of Woodland Hills and the Valley and Los Angeles in general. This is the largest project in the Valley encompassing almost 500,000 square feet of shopping development with building heights up to 247.5 feet - some 24 stories tall. This project is huge and will affect generations to come.

It respectfully is the responsibility of the City's Planning Department to protect our precious land resource, to insure its preservation and use in ways which are economically and socially desirable in an attempt to improve the quality of life in our community.

It is hard to imagine that a short 45 day review period of a project DEIR of this magnitude with issues that run deep in the waters of expert knowledge is adequate time for the public to digest the materials, seek the expertise needed and properly respond.

It is not just the opportunity to be heard that is paramount to due process but also the opportunity to know and understand what needs a response.

It would require a person to read or examine approximately one hundred (100) pages a day to complete the materials in the DEIR and that would leave no time to respond.

Such a task thrust upon the public is against all reasonable logic and this process as presented to the public in this community is a denial of all our Constitutionally guaranteed rights as citizens to due process and should proceed no further.

Response to Comment No. 57-1

The California Code of Regulations, Section 15105(a), provides that "the public review period for a draft EIR shall not be less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. When a draft EIR is submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies, the public review period shall not be less than 45 days, unless a shorter period, not less than 30 days, is approved by the State Clearinghouse." The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document. The public will have continued

opportunities to provide input at each of the public hearings that will be held by the City of Los Angeles on the project.

The project would be consistent with the vision and the land use designations under the current Warner Center Specific Plan and other adopted plans. Specifically, as discussed in detail in Section IV.E, Land Use of the Draft EIR, the project conforms to the Specific Plan and the project would be consistent with the land use designations and the intent of the goals, objectives and policies set forth in the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan and the General Plan Framework Element. In addition, in response to community comments received after the Notice of Preparation was issued in 2007 as well as changes in economic conditions, the project was reduced in size by approximately 774,000 square feet. The Draft EIR includes an executive summary that provides an overview of each of the environmental impact analyses within the Draft EIR. This overview includes a discussion of the potential impacts of the project, proposed mitigation measures and a discussion of the impacts of the project after implementation of the mitigation measures. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 57-2

2. DISPOSAL OF FOOD WASTE PRODUCTS:

There are no plans for disposal of the food waste from the restaurants, the hotel or from Costco. The food waste is an attractive nuisance for disease and vermin. There are no segregated disposal location [sic] nor adequate sanitation procedures.

The community requires proper sanitation to prevent the spread of disease.

Response to Comment No. 57-2

As discussed in Response to Comment No. 44-3, all tenants including the hotel and anchor store, must adhere to federal, state, and local sanitary requirements that protect personal safety, minimize vermin intrusions, and prevent the spread of disease. Refuse containers would be screened from view. The truck loading bays for trash pick-up are would meet Los Angeles Municipal Code regulations, and will facilitate the efficient loading and unloading of merchandise away from pedestrian corridors and active retail areas.

Comment No. 57-3

3. LACK OF CONSIDERATION WITH OTHER PROPOSED PROJECTS:

The DEIR fails to consider the impact on the environment and the community when combined with other significant projects in the immediate area [sic]. The Rocketdyne Projects and the proposed use of the Catalina Yacht property. When these build-outs are completed the combined affect of [sic] the community has not been addressed adequately and no plans for minimize [sic] the adverse effects are even suggested.

Response to Comment No. 57-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 18-46.

Comment No. 57-4

4. LACK OF AN ADEQUATE COMMUNITY CENTER:

The Applicant attempts to placate the community with a Community Center within the project. However, it is to be constructed in phase two in the basement of the hotel. There is doubt and certainly no guarantees [sic] that the project will ever go beyond the first phase. The Community Center should be a stand alone [sic] facility that is build from the beginning to serve the community and to offset the adverse effects of this project both in phase one and subsequent phases.

Response to Comment No. 57-4

The community/cultural center proposed as part of the project will not be located in the proposed hotel. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-10 and Response to Comment No. 18-34 for more information regarding the proposed community center.

Comment No. 57-5

5. GAS STATION:

A. Focused EIR - This portion of the project is inconsistent with the rest of the project and with the community in general. The basic plan here is for retail and hotel. The ancillary member-only fueling station, tire installation center, and internet auto sales use is not coherent with the rest of the project.

Due to the nature of the hazardous waste and products including the gas, batteries, oil and tires, this portion of the project should be separate from the main project and require a focused environmental impact report.

Response to Comment No. 57-5

The Draft EIR thoroughly analyzed the environmental impact of the proposed fueling station, tire installation center, and internet auto sales use. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for additional information regarding the design of the project and anchor retailer and Topical Response No. 4 for a detailed discussion of potential safety issues related to the member-only fueling station. The storage of new and used tires, batteries, oil, and related products will comply with all federal, state and local regulations. The storage area for used and new tires is within the building confines of the service area and all tires and batteries are kept indoors until they are picked up for disposal. A contractor specializing in the disposal and recycling of hazardous items would remove tires, oil, and batteries from the site.

Comment No. 57-6

There are inadequate plans for the storage of the material and most importantly for the disposal of the discarded hazardous items.

Response to Comment No. 57-6

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 44-12 regarding the disposal of hazardous materials.

Comment No. 57-7

B. Gas Refueling Trucks: Besides the unacceptable numbers of daily deliveries, the ingress of the fueling trucks is at best cumbersome and will create insurmountable traffic issues. As an example, there are no limits on the length of the refueling trucks. They would be entering from Owensmouth and exiting onto Victory and be required to make an immediate right turn onto southbound Owensmouth. A tandem refueling truck would not physically be able to exit onto Victory and get into the right lane without making a wide turn and blocking almost if not all eastbound lanes of Victory Boulevard. This traffic hazard is not capable of mitigation under the present plan that includes a gas station. The station should be eliminated from this plan.

Response to Comment No. 57-7

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding the fuel station's queuing and fuel truck deliveries.

Comment No. 57-8

C. Old Data For The Water Table: The baseline used for the water table that will contact the storage tanks is an outdated improper baseline. The statistics are based on 2007 data and lack the present reality of the heavy rains that have flooded the area in recent periods.

New reliable core samples must be taken to assure that the water table is sufficiently low to permit the installation of the gas storage tanks and prevent the contamination of the ground water. Contamination should NEVER occur [sic] under even under the worse of environmental disasters such as heavy rains or earthquakes.

Response to Comment No. 57-8

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for regarding the safety measures associated with the fueling station and underground storage tanks and the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the fueling station. The most recent groundwater level measurements, conducted on May 17, 2011, are included in the updated March 2011 Geotechnical Report, included as Appendix C of the Final EIR.

Comment No. 57-9

In *Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Assn. v. City of Sunnyvale City Council* (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 1351 (attached as Appendix "L" to the DIR), the courts have made it clear that the baseline must be representative of the current environmental conditions.

The Court in *Sunnyvale* stated:

"Case law makes clear that "[a]n EIR must focus on impacts to the existing environment, not hypothetical situations. (Citations omitted) "It is only against this baseline that any significant environmental effects can be determined. (Citations omitted). (Emphasis added).

The Court in *Environmental Planning Information Council v. County of El Dorado*, supra, 131 Cal.App.3d 350, at 358 explained:

"An approach using hypothetical allowable conditions as the baseline results in 'illusory' comparisons that 'can only mislead the public as to the reality of the impacts and subvert full consideration of the actual environmental impacts,' a result at direct odds with CEQA's intent."

Use of an incorrect baseline for assessing the impacts of a proposed project is generally treated as a prejudicial abuse of discretion. [See e.g. [sic] *Communities For A Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist.*, (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310].

We must question the viability of the baseline for such impact issues as the existing noise conditions in the project vicinity; the transportation impact; the urban blight issues; and the existing air quality conditions.

The *Sunnyvale* Court brings this all into focus:

"...the comparative merits of the project and each alternative, including the "no project" alternative, cannot be accurately compared if the proposed project's significant effects have not been fully ascertained and disclosed in the first place."

Without a reliable baseline it is impossible for anyone to reliably determine the nature and extent of the project's significant impact on the environment and the community. It denies the public its right to informed participation.

The DEIR is fatally flawed, both here and in other areas, for its failure to provide an adequate baseline for determination of the impact.

Response to Comment No. 57-9

In accordance with CEQA, the baseline from which impacts of the project are generally evaluated is existing conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation for the project, which was released in October 2007. Where appropriate, changes to these existing conditions since 2007 have been described. With regard to traffic in particular, a supplemental analysis was prepared to demonstrate that use of the 2007 traffic count data is more conservative than use of recent traffic count data as traffic levels have generally improved since 2007 due to changes in economic conditions. In addition to accounting for existing conditions, several of the impact analyses also take into consideration conditions expected at buildout of the project. For example, pursuant to LADOT guidelines, the traffic analysis identifies expected future conditions at the various intersections in 2013 and 2016 and accounts for trips resulting from ambient growth. This approach provides for a more conservative and realistic analysis of traffic impacts associated with the project when

compared with an approach that would evaluate the project relative to existing conditions. Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-41 for a more detailed discussion of the Draft EIR's consistency with CEQA, including the *Sunnyvale* decision.

Comment No. 57-10

D. Security From Catastrophic Events: There are no plans for securing the area where this huge amount of explosive gas is to be stored. The amount of gas at this location is beyond belief. Some three (3) 30,000 gallon gasoline tanks for a total explosive liquid concentration of 90,000 gallons.

There are no contingency plans for a catastrophic event that engulfs the gas station area in flames - regardless if initiated by terrorist act or that of nature. To put that much explosive liquid that close to stores and people without adequate contingency [sic] plans is unthinkable and irresponsible.

Response to Comment No. 57-10

Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 regarding the safety measures that would be implemented as part of the fueling station.

Comment No. 57-11

E. Lack of Adequate Showing Of Need For The Gas Station: There is inadequate data or baseline to determine the community need for such a large gas station in this area with the surrounding presently existing stations. There are no long lines at the surrounding locations, no indication of price fixing and no showing of lack of access.

Given the traffic congestion and safety concerns, the contamination of the water table, the storage and disposal of the hazardous wastes and the lack of security contingency plans for a highly explosives area, it is hard to imagine that the inclusion of a gas station at this location in this proposed project makes any sense to the environment or the community. There are alternative sites that are better suited for such an adventure.

The gas station should be excluded from [sic] this project and the DEIR and it should be subject to a later focused EIR if there is further interest in proceeding with that plan.

Response to Comment No. 57-11

The impacts of all project land uses, including the fueling station, are addressed in the Draft EIR. Please refer to Topical Response No. 4 for a detailed discussion of the

proposed fueling station's environmental impacts and Topical Response No. 6 for an analysis of the potential urban decay impact of the proposed member-only fueling station. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 57-12

CONCLUSION:

There are too many areas to adequately respond and insufficient time to do so. At best we as a community have placed out trust in our governmental representatives to do the right thing for each of us and our community. Woodland Hills is a precious gem in the Valley and in all of Los Angeles. Any project for this area must be an improvement of the quality of life for us all. To do otherwise would be to abandon the trust and power that we give to our government. WE are not against development only against abuse. We want the best for our community from anyone who comes here and should settle for nothing less. What is done her [sic] will affect generations to come and will set the course for the future of our community.

Our concerns, our fears, our wishes and desires are placed into your hands with prayers that the right thing will be done for the right reasons.

Response to Comment No. 57-12

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 46-1 for information regarding the public's opportunities to comment on the project.

The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public comment period that was extended by 15 days, for a total of 60 days, in order to provide additional time for interested parties to review and comment on the document. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 58

Petition by:

Deborah Barnhart
Robert H. Young
Shirley Young
Robert Carlan
Jane Michalak
Kelly A. Russell
Jessica Braccante

Community Redevelopment Advocate
6351 Owensmouth Ave., Ste. 210
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 58-1

THIS IS WHAT WESTFIELD IS PROPOSING FOR ITS PROPERTY BETWEEN THE TOPANGA PLAZA AND THE PROMENADE MALL [sic]

A site plan for a new Costco, a 20+ pump gas station, a 6-7 story [sic] parking garage, plus a hotel, office building and additional retail space.

How can the corner of Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue be a suitable place for Costco in light of the following facts:

1. The Costco "Big Box" store is almost directly abutting the sidewalk along Victory Boulevard.
2. The back side of the Costco "Big Box" store is a wall running approximately 450 feet along Victory Boulevard. The wall creates a blight in Woodland Hills for drivers, shoppers, walkers and visitors.

Response to Comment No. 58-1

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the parking structure constructed as part of Phase 2 would be a grade plus five-level parking structure, not 6 to 7 levels, as stated by the Commentor. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the façade of the anchor retailer building and the streetscape improvements proposed along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 58-2

3. The plan for up to a 20 pump [sic] gas station is untenable. It has no easy ingress or egress for fuel delivery, and insufficient queuing for automobiles on a street that is already rated F.

Response to Comment No. 58-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing.

Comment No. 58-3

There appears [sic] no way to mitigate traffic at Victory Boulevard and Owensmouth Avenue.

Response to Comment No. 58-3

Mitigation Measure H-17 is the proposed mitigation at the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard. Upon completion of the project, the project impact is anticipated to be reduced to a level below significance.

Comment No. 58-4

This is what Costco Wants [sic]:

- A 20 + pump gas status - Entrance on Owensmouth
- A parking lot the size of 3 football fields
- A 450 foot [sic] long back wall of Costco facing Victory

Lets [sic] Make Woodland Hills a Better Place by Eliminating the Costco Big Box Concept

Response to Comment No. 58-4

This comment expressing opposition for the development of Costco and its ancillary fueling station use in Woodland Hills is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 59

John Bagley
Owensmouth Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 59-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 59-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 59-2

NO COSTCO IN WOODLAND HILLS

Response to Comment No. 59-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 60

Louise C. Benson
5779 Rolling Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 60-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 60-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 60-2

I live at the intersection of Topanga Cyn. Blvd & Oxnard St and due to the huge increase in the volume of traffic, I will never be able to exit my street.

Response to Comment No. 60-2

The intersection of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street currently operates at level of service D or better during all peak periods. With completion of the project and implementation of the mitigation program, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service D or better during all peak periods. This level of service is considered acceptable by LADOT. The level of traffic on Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Oxnard Street are consistent with the street classifications identified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Circulation Element (Adopted September 1999).

Comment No. 60-3

We do not need huge and very heavy gasoline trucks on our local streets here in beautiful Woodland Hills. I am dismayed at the thought of putting this unsightly store, gas pumps & parking lot in my neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 60-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 57-11 for a discussion of the proposed fueling station and Topical Response No. 5 for more detail regarding the design of the project, including the fueling station. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 61

D. Bermejo
Strathern
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Comment No. 61-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 61-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 62

Ann Breitenbucher
5807 Topanga Canyon Blvd., #302
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 62-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? No
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? No
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? No

Response to Comment No. 62-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 62-2

The traffic and crowds are too much.

Response to Comment No. 62-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 62-3

Too many exceptions to Specific Plan

Response to Comment No. 62-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-17 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 63

Marcia Buckingham
5550 Topanga Canyon Blvd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 63-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 63-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 63-2

No gas station. No Costco in Westfield Topanga.

Response to Comment No. 63-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 64

Madeline Conroy
Woodland Hills, CA

Comment No. 64-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 64-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 64-2

This type of retailer does not belong in Topanga Westfield. Can you imagine putting a Costco in the middle of Century City. Woodland Hills is the Century City of the Valley.

Response to Comment No. 64-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more detail regarding the design of the project, including the anchor retailer. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 65

Michelle Conroy
Lockhurst Dr
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 65-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 65-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 65-2

COSTCO IS A WHOLESALE WAREHOUSE.

WARNER CENTER IS NOT A PLACE TO HAVE A WAREHOUSE

Response to Comment No. 65-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 17-4 for a discussion of the anchor retailer as a permitted use at the project site. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more detail regarding the design of the project, including the anchor retailer. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 66

Teresa Conroy
5816 Lockhurst Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 66-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 66-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 66-2

Costco does not belong to the Warner Center Area. The congestion that will [sic] bring to the area will be terrible, especially w/ the gas station. Costco should find another location.

Response to Comment No. 66-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for issues related to traffic and circulation for the project, including the member-only fueling station. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 67

Mike Coscolluela
5816 Lockhurst Drive
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 67-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 67-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 67-2

Costco has to find a different location. We don't want Costco in Westfield Topanga.

No gas stations

Response to Comment No. 67-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 68

Ruth Crespin
21650 Burbank Blvd., Unit 219
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-7425

Comment No. 68-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? YES
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? They are working hard to make it grand
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? It can not [sic] be so bad that it can't be resolved [sic] Let's move ahead! Why have empty lots with no greenery – This village is needed –

Response to Comment No. 68-1

This comment expresses support for the project. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 69

B. Tan-Gana
Woodland Hills, CA

Comment No. 69-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 69-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 70

David Gibson
6351 Owensmouth Ave., #101A
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 70-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 70-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 70-2

NO EXCEPTIONS FOR COSTCO

Response to Comment No. 70-2

The project is intended to conform to the Specific Plan, and is requesting approvals that are consistent with and permitted by the Specific Plan. However, should City staff not find consistency on any issue, the Specific Plan also includes a process for Exceptions where appropriate under the Specific Plan. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 71

Peggy Gibson
6351 Owensmouth Ave., #101A
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 71-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 71-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 71-2

No Exceptions for Costco

Response to Comment No. 71-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 72

Virginia Halpape
4200 Michelangelo Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 72-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? no
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? yes
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 72-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 72-2

no – and the congestion @ [sic] the gas pump area will be too much w/ gas being delivered 3x a day – [sic]

Response to Comment No. 72-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for information regarding the fuel station's queuing and fuel truck deliveries.

Comment No. 72-3

Parking for Costco is poor and therefore I would not go to shop [sic]

Response to Comment No. 72-3

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of the project's surface and structured parking. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 72-4

The Greater West Valley Alliance is supported by private citizens as well as other community organizations such as the Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization

For more information and for other community resources, please visit our website:
<http://www.gwva.org>

I agree with all of the above. //s//

Response to Comment No. 72-4

This comment regarding supporters of the Greater West Valley Alliance is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 73

John Holland
7940 Topanga Canyon Blvd.
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Comment No. 73-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?

2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?

3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 73-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 74

M.E. Holland
P.O. Box 32
Woodland Hills, CA 91365

Comment No. 74-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 74-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 74-2

Traffic will be horrible!

Response to Comment No. 74-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of the project's traffic study analysis and conclusions.

Comment Letter No. 75

Bruce Ingram
10449 Andora Ave.
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Comment No. 75-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?

Response to Comment No. 75-1

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-17 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 75-2

Why would Costo [sic] be allowed to put a wholesale store in a retail complex?

Response to Comment No. 75-2

As discussed in Response to Comment No. 17-4, the anchor tenant will be a retailer, and not a wholesaler, as the tenant will be selling to individual consumers, and not only to businesses or institutions for resale. However, per Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.14.A.1(b)(2), wholesale businesses are permitted in the project site's (WC)C2 zone.

Comment No. 75-3

Wouldn't a gas station at Owensmouth & Victory cause unbearable congestion [sic]?

Response to Comment No. 75-3

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing.

Comment Letter No. 76

A. Jones
Topanga Canyon Blvd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 76-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 76-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 77

Mrs. Joan Krolak
4305 Cezanne Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 77-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 77-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 77-2

The area is so overcrowded now, it will be gridlock [sic]

Response to Comment No. 77-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of the project's traffic study analysis and conclusions.

Comment No. 77-3

Save Warner Center and stop Costco [sic]

Response to Comment No. 77-3

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 78

Celia Lamboun
20305 Gresham St.
Winnetka, CA 91306

Comment No. 78-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 78-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 78-2

Imagine the congestion at that corner!

Response to Comment No. 78-2

The Commentor does not specifically describe the corner referenced in this comment. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 78-3

I know of no one who wants or needs a Costco in that area!

Response to Comment No. 78-3

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 79

Lisa Lamboun
7515 Hatillo Ave.
Winnetka, CA 91306

Comment No. 79-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 79-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 79-2

We don't want a Costco there.

Response to Comment No. 79-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 80

Ms. Anita Martin
22429 MacFarlane Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 80-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 80-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.7

Comment No. 80-2

No! But if properly planned - ie [sic] – use the busline – build tram/trolley [sic] atmosphere where cars will not be able to get near – walking or shuttle service (like disneyland [sic]) and it will be a joy.

Response to Comment No. 80-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-2 for a discussion of a sub-regional shuttle.

Comment Letter No. 81

Anita Martin
22429 MacFarlane Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 81-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 81-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 81-2

Build trams or other means to take people to the shops before building shops [sic]

Create an atmosphere where cars cannot get through, then expand [sic]

Response to Comment No. 81-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 7-2 for a discussion of a sub-regional shuttle. In addition, the project has been designed to minimize cut-through traffic within the project site. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 82

Max Oliver
Jumilla St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 82-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 82-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 82-2

The addition of Costco and the gas station will only serve to undermine the uniqueness of the Westfield Topanga experience. Please reconsider. Say no to Costco [sic]

Response to Comment No. 82-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 83

M. Onate
Califa
Woodland Hills, CA

Comment No. 83-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 83-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 83-2

Gas station will cause congestion [sic]

Response to Comment No. 83-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing.

Comment Letter No. 84

Deanna Palic
21931 Burbank Blvd., #49
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 84-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 84-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 84-2

Against Costco in Woodland Hills.

Response to Comment No. 84-2

This comment expressing opposition for the development of a Costco in Woodland Hills is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 85

Josip Palic
21931 Burbank Blvd., #49
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 85-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 85-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 85-2

Against Costco in Woodland Hills [sic]

Response to Comment No. 85-2

This comment expressing opposition for the development of a Costco in Woodland Hills is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 86

Denise A. Richardson
9162 Sophia Ave.
North Hills, CA 91343

Comment No. 86-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 86-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 86-2

Why is Woodland Hills being saddled with a 450' wall with no active uses.

Response to Comment No. 86-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building's design and streetscape improvements along Victory Boulevard.

Comment No. 86-3

There is only minimal walkability provided.

Response to Comment No. 86-3

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the pedestrian-oriented design of the project.

Comment Letter No. 87

Carol Russell
22144 Ybarra Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 87-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 87-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 87-2

Why do we need the gas pumps? There are more gas stations in that area!

Response to Comment No. 87-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 6 regarding other fueling stations in the area. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 87-3

Too much traffic!!!

Response to Comment No. 87-3

Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of traffic and parking issues related to the project.

Comment Letter No. 88

Shaham Soluki
Woodland Hills, CA

Comment No. 88-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 88-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 88-2

The traffic caused by the gas station will be horrible.

Response to Comment No. 88-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing.

Comment Letter No. 89

Stuart
Woodland Hills CA

Comment No. 89-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 89-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 89-2

Leave Costco in Canoga Park.

Response to Comment No. 89-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 90

Loraine Veeck
5704 McDonie Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 90-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 90-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 90-2

A gas station on this busy corner would be nothing but trouble.

We already have an awful structure on Owensmouth. We don't need high walls in addition.

Response to Comment No. 90-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing. Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 for information regarding the fuel station's screening.

Comment Letter No. 91

R. Veeck
5704 McDonie Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 91-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 91-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 91-2

A gas station at Victory & Owensmouth is not Acceptable [sic] for traffic [sic] & safety issues.

Response to Comment No. 91-2

While the project does add traffic to the intersection of Owensmouth Avenue and Victory Boulevard, the intersection is projected to operate at level of service C or better during all peak periods; this is defined as an acceptable level of service. Please refer to Topical Response No. 2 for additional information regarding the fuel station's queuing. Please also refer to Topical Response No. 4 for information regarding the safety measures associated with the fuel station.

Comment No. 91-3

A 400 foot [sic] wall along Victory Blvd [sic] is unacceptable and will be a blight on the neighborhood!

Response to Comment No. 91-3

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 13-7 and Topical Response No. 5 for more information regarding the anchor retail building's Victory Boulevard design.

Comment Letter No. 92

Anonymous

Comment No. 92-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? NO
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? NO
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? NO

Response to Comment No. 92-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 92-2

We are not against Costco, but this site is not the place for Costco.

Costco is usually in an industrial area and this site would be a detriment to this neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 92-2

As discussed in Response to Comment No. 17-4, Costco is a retailer and is a permitted use within the project site's (WC)C2 zone.

Comment Letter No. 93

Louise Barche
22117 Independencia St.

Comment No. 93-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? NO
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? NO
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? NO

Response to Comment No. 93-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 93-2

Gas stations would create a big traffic problem. The traffic currently is heavy. Find a different location. We do not need additional traffic here.

Response to Comment No. 93-2

Please refer to Response to Comment No. 49-4. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 94

Elizabeth Caraway
22859 Ostronic Dr.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-6139

Comment No. 94-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? NO
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? Yes
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? NO

Costco - OK

Ignoring overall planning NO

Response to Comment No. 94-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment Letter No. 95

George Enfield
22385 Alguas Rd.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 95-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 95-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 95-2

Costco has a well located [sic] building. It serves a WIDE community from there and employees will be let go or have other problems due to the move. Their current location will benefit from upgrades.

Response to Comment No. 95-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 96

The Marantz Family
22859 Hatteras St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 96-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan?
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center?
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines?

Response to Comment No. 96-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 96-2

The traffic along Topanga Canyon, Owensmouth and surrounding streets is already horrendous!

Response to Comment No. 96-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Please refer to Topical Response No. 1 for a discussion of the project's traffic study analysis and conclusions.

Comment No. 96-3

COSCO [sic] and the Oil Co is SO BIG that no common person has a say!!

Response to Comment No. 96-3

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 96-4

There are too many gas stations now. A nearby COSCOE [sic] in Canoga Park.

Response to Comment No. 96-4

Please refer to Topical Response No. 6 regarding the number of gas stations in the area. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 97

Norma Pedraglio
20449 Aetna St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Comment No. 97-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? No
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? No
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? No

Response to Comment No. 97-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 97-2

The site for the Costco project is too small and inadequate.

That sort of operation does not fit in "our village" [sic]

Response to Comment No. 97-2

Please refer to Topical Response No. 5 regarding the adequacy of the project site to accommodate the anchor retailer. This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 98

Jennifer S
22117 Independencia St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Comment No. 98-1

1. Should the development of Warner Center be granted numerous and various exceptions to the Warner Center Specific Plan? NO
2. Should the building architecture and plan go against good planning that would comply with the Warner Center Specific Plan and be a better fit for Warner Center? NO
3. Since the Warner Center Specific Plan calls for incorporation of certain objectives and design guidelines for projects located along the Owensmouth Parkway, which will be violated by the development, should Westfield be granted an exception to the Owensmouth Parkway urban design guidelines? NO

Response to Comment No. 98-1

Please refer to Response to Comment Nos. 13-17 through 13-19 regarding the project's consistency with the Warner Center Specific Plan.

Comment No. 98-2

We have too much traffic now [sic]

Response to Comment No. 98-2

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. Please also refer to Response to Comment No. 74-2 for information about the project's impacts to nearby intersections.

Comment Letter No. 99

DiAnna Watson
IGR/CEQA Program Manager
Department of Transportation
District 7, Regional Planning
IGR/CEQA Branch
100 Main Street, MS # 16
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606
Phone: (213) 897-6536
Fax: (213) 897-1337

Comment No. 99-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for The Village at Westfield Topanga project in Woodland Hills.

Based on review of the project Traffic Study report, Caltrans concurs with the Traffic consultant's findings, recommended improvements on SR-27, and fair share contribution towards future improvements on the US-101 freeway. It is recommended that the City of Los Angeles condition the project subject to all the recommendations in the Traffic Study.

Caltrans requests that the City collect the fair share amount for deposit into a specific account created for the future State Project EA 22590, as mentioned in the Traffic Report.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Nerses Armand Yerjanian, the project coordinator at (213) 897-6536 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 11022INY.

Response to Comment No. 99-1

Caltrans has recommended that as a Condition of Approval, the Applicant provide a fair share contribution towards the widening of the US-101/Ventura Boulevard – Topanga Canyon Boulevard south-bound off-ramp (Caltrans EA#22590). The project's fair share contribution is estimated at a maximum of \$ 285,360 (as indicated in the Caltrans Supplemental Analysis [June 2011] attached to this Final EIR as Appendix Q). Prior to the commencement of the project's Phase 2 construction, the Applicant would establish a fair share agreement with Caltrans in order to demonstrate the ability and intent to pay the estimated fair share contribution. The project would comply with any Conditions of Approval related to the collection of a fair share contribution set forth by the City of Los Angeles as part of the project's approval. Since this fair share contribution does not

represent mitigation of a significant project impact, the environmental impact of the project is unaffected by implementation of such a Condition of Approval. For the supplemental traffic and parking analysis, please refer to Appendix Q, Supplemental Caltrans Analyses of this Final EIR.